The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1937 NUMBER 1203

Contents

The Week 181

Editorials

From "Lusitania" to "Panay" 183
The NAM through the Ages 184
Educating the Workers 185

General Articles

No One Shall Starve ..... Jonathan Mitchell 186
Eddies in National Power Policy ..... Morris L. Cooke 187
Britain Approaches the Führer ..... H. N. Brailsford 190
Why Franco Has Hesitated ..... William P. Mangold 192
The Stockwells of Minnesota ..... Dorothy Walton Binder 194
Shoot the Works ..... Heywood Broun 195
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 196
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 197
Winter Garden and Siege ..... Stark Young 198
The Bandwagon 199
A Communication ..... John L. Childs 200

Correspondence 201

Books in Review

Fiction for the Millions ..... Robert Cantwell 203
In Praise of Prairie (verse) ..... Theodore Roethke 203
Soldiers and Society ..... Frederick L. Schuman 204
Pioneers of Medicine ..... Creighton Barker, M.D. 204
A Trail Trails Off ..... Kenneth Burke 205
The Spirit of Science ..... Miriam Borgenicht 206
Wisdom of India ..... Morton Dauwen Zabel 206
Books in Brief 207

More Bluster from Rome

Italy's announcement that she is leaving the League of Nations is like the revelation of a divorce between people who have been separated for years and who have fought in public every time they met. As news it was far less dramatic and impressive than it evidently was meant to be. The ominous aspect of the affair, however, is that it was intended to frighten Britain and France, and followed immediately upon the visit of Lord Halifax to Germany. The British Cabinet has been naïve enough to suppose that friendly gestures would conciliate Germany and Italy either separately or together, and thus end all cause for worry. But refusing to be conciliated is the stock-in-trade of the rulers of these two nations. The progress they have already made in international power and prestige has been the result of frightening Great Britain into concessions, and they see no reason for abandoning this profitable policy as long as their insatiable appetites drive them on. The more yielding the British are, the more insistent they become. And of course nothing could be more futile than the effort to detach one from the other, because it is their joint threat that produces the greatest fear. If now Mr. Chamberlain should make a gesture of friendliness to Mussolini, he would be inviting Hitler to become more belligerent.

News From Hendaye

On Monday, December 13, an Associated Press dispatch, sent from Hendaye, France, the day before, announced in lurid language that Franco's long awaited offensive had begun and that three Loyalist fronts, at Toledo, Brunete and Teruel, had collapsed completely under the attack which hit "like a bolt of lightning." The account went on to list in considerable detail the new acceleration of Rebel activity, including a "great air battle" in which the Loyalist forces had suffered heavy losses. A wary reader would have been careful to note that the only authority quoted for the news of the "general offensive" was an "Insurgent communique." Nevertheless The New York Times, for instance, gave the story a prominent front-page position under the headline "Three Drives Started By Spanish Rebels." By the following day the rumored Rebel offensive had disappeared under a blanket of snow. Without an explicit statement, the Associated Press report, again from Hendaye, made it perfectly plain that the first story had no basis and that a decisive military drive before spring is unlikely. Will another offensive, and spring, be here day after tomorrow?

Trotsky

The American group studying the case of Leon Trotsky, and the associated similar groups in England, France and Czechoslovakia, have now completed their report on the question of Trotsky's guilt or innocence on the charges made against him in the Moscow trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937. The document is 80,000 words in length, and we have not had an opportunity to read it as this issue of The New Republic goes to press. Reports in the daily newspapers of the mass meeting in New York City at which it was presented, indicate, however, that Trotsky and his son, Leon Sedov, are found not guilty on all counts.

The summary presented by Dr. John Dewey, chairman of the committee, reveals a belief that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trotsky never ordered the assassination of Soviet officials or acts of sabotage. He never, in the committee's opinion, conspired with foreign powers or sought the restoration of capitalism in the USSR. He did not meet conspirators in Copenhagen or in Paris, as was charged in Moscow, and it is denied that letters exist implicating him. The statement is made that the Moscow trials violated Soviet law, made no effort to obtain the truth, employed confessions made under duress, and brought forward no evidence of importance except these self-incriminating confessions. Dr. Dewey said the members of the committee are "appalled by the utterly discreditable character of the whole Moscow trial proceedings, at once flimsy and vicious" and that they constitute "repudiation by a disciplined organization, worldwide in scope and influence, of the principles of truth and justice upon which the foundations of civilization are laid."

Detailed comment on these extremely serious charges must wait until we have had an opportunity to examine the full text and learn how much new evidence the committee has assembled. In the meantime, we may observe that its efforts were apparently devoted to the question of Trotsky's guilt or innocence and not to the correlated matter of whether there was in fact a widespread conspiracy against the present Soviet government. We believe it is true that most Americans interested in this subject are more deeply concerned with the question of the conspiracy—with its obvious repercussions on international politics and the peace of the world—than they are with the allegations that Trotsky was its master mind.

Hush-Hush and the Railroads

A concerted and almost desperate effort is now being made to stop the investigation, by a committee of the United States Senate, of railroad financing. Characteristic was the demand by Senator Burke of Nebraska that the inquiry be halted as a gesture of good will toward business. Referring to the reorganization of the St. Paul Railroad in 1928, the Senator is quoted as saying "What if it was ill conceived? What good can it do us to investigate it now?"

The kindest interpretation of this remark is that Mr. Burke was joking. Investigation of the finances of bankrupt American roads has already had results of the greatest value, and Senator Burke is well aware of them. Undesirable practices by prominent and respectable institutions, including the New York Stock Exchange, have been modified. Others will need to be changed by legislation, and such legislation can be based only on accurate knowledge of what has taken place.

In the case of the St. Paul, for example, the road went bankrupt in 1935. Its directors, and the life-insurance companies, proposed a new plan which was blocked primarily by Senator Burton Wheeler of Montana. Today, two years later, the backers of the scheme have confessed their idea would not have worked and would have meant default on the interest charges within six months. It has recently been reported that the RFC is about to resume its lending to the railroads. Under the law, it can only do so if the loan is a good risk—and if it is, the roads can get plenty of money from the banks. Senator Burke's policy is that of the doctor who, if a patient were gravely ill, would tell him to pretend not to notice his pain and perhaps it would go away. The national health is not preserved by any such policy.

The Mercury and The New Republic

In the December issue of The American Mercury there appears an attack upon The New Republic and The Nation. Its author, Harold Lord Varney, a former IWW and afterward co-founder with Lawrence Dennis of the American Fascist Party, weeps many bitter tears because these periodicals do not satisfy his definition of "liberalism"—however much, in view of his history, that definition may be worth. We had intended to ignore Mr. Varney's article, but since a few of our readers have written to us about it, it may be well to say categorically that all the charges he regards as most damning are false. As we point out in our answer to Max Eastman on page 202 of this issue, The New Republic is not Stalinist, Trotskyist or any other variety of communist. It is an American journal working in the American tradition for the betterment of life in this country. That fact is the real basis for the animus displayed by Mr. Varney.

His article acquires added interest in the light of a bit of history. A good many months ago, the editors of The American Mercury approached Henry F. Pringle, distinguished journalist and author, whose books include "Theodore Roosevelt, A Biography," and asked him to write an article about The New Republic and The Nation. This he did, and turned in his manuscript. Although he was promptly paid the stipulated price, he was told firmly that The American Mercury would not print his article. It was explained that what that magazine wanted was an article indicating that the liberal journals were tools of Moscow and constituted a great danger to the United States. Mr. Pringle replied that he did not propose to stultify himself by writing things that he regarded as unfair and untrue. Thereupon, the matter was dropped until Mr. Varney was persuaded to write the article.

News Notes of a Week

Soviet Russia's first election under her new Constitution took place on Sunday, December 12. Since in almost all instances there was but a single candidate for each office, the results contained no surprises. . . . Snow and bitter cold in Spain seemed to make further large-scale fighting at present unlikely, except in the air. . . . The German government announced that under no circumstances would Germany rejoin the League. . . . France, in her not very successful effort to revive the friendship with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Little Entente, managed to dig up a pending commercial treaty with Jugoslavia.

At home, Congress continued to struggle with the farm and wage-and-hour bills. . . . Joseph P. Kennedy, former head of the SEC and of the Maritime Commission, is to be Ambassador to the Court of St. James; Ambassador William E. Dodd, now in Berlin, has resigned, and changes are expected in the American representatives in Paris, Rome and Moscow. . . . Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City continued in his "I am the law" policy, defying the CIO, the American Civil Liberties Union and an important group of members of Congress. . . . The National Maritime Union voted overwhelmingly to join the CIO. . . . The Republican Party began to hold conferences out of which it hoped to reform itself. . . . Alfred P. Sloan of General Motors set up a $10,000,000 fund for the dissemination of "economic truth." . . . American progressivism lost a loyal friend with the death of Mrs. Elizabeth Glendower Evans of Boston.

From "Lusitania" to "Panay"

WHEN A foreign army bombs and sinks American gunboats and merchant vessels, or kills and wounds American military forces and civilians, the incident may easily become a *casus belli*. The very least this nation can do in self-respect is what President Roosevelt has done in the case of the recent incident on the Yangtze River—to demand apologies and recompense, and to ask for guarantees that the same sort of thing will not happen in the future. Yet the most complete satisfaction which it is possible for Japan to render in these terms will not remove the danger inherent in the situation. The memory will rankle and will reinforce the anger already felt against Japanese aggression in China. No assurance by Tokyo can keep another such incident from occurring, since, according to reliable information, the army rules the government, and the high command of the army is helpless before its conquest-mad younger officers.

There is no question that the men who executed the attack against the "Panay" and the Standard Oil tankers, as well as those who fired at the British gunboats in another part of the river, knew perfectly well what they were doing. No accident or mistake—on their part—was involved. The boats were well identified, and the Japanese command had been informed of their location. The truth is that the government can apologize and promise indefinitely, but it cannot control the men who fly its planes and shoot its guns. These men precipitated the war and will continue the war at their own will and in their own fashion.

We always run a similar danger, however, when our ships, our sailors and our civilians are present in any area of open hostilities. American soldiers and civilians in Belgium and northern France between 1914 and 1917 would certainly have been victims of German missiles, and would have brought us into the war against Germany long before we entered it. Why, then, are our gunboats and citizens in the Yangtze? The anomaly is simply explained. Japan is not at war with China. The President has decided that this is so; therefore for the United States it officially is so. We consequently retain in China the rights of peaceful foreigners in a peaceful country. Having those rights, we must keep them by exercising them. Japan, if she wants to conquer China, must manage to do it without injuring our nationals there, or transgressing our rights and interests. This is good legal theory, perhaps, but we should not be astonished or grieved when it forces us in the direction of belligerency. It *is* "craven," as the patriots assert, to withdraw our forces, to surrender our rights without protest, under these circumstances. On the other hand, if Japan were at war, to withdraw before such incidents occurred would be elementary prudence.

Responsibility for preserving the anomalous situation in which these regrettable incidents are bound to happen rests squarely upon President Roosevelt and those who support him in refusing to fulfill the will of Congress by invoking the Neutrality Act. Let us see where we should stand if the President had acknowledged reality by declaring that a state of war exists and had thus brought the Neutrality Act into operation. Our citizens would, of course, have been evacuated from China. Presumably our warships would have followed. American merchant ships would be forbidden to carry arms to either belligerent. If, in spite of these precautions, oil tankers or ships carrying other merchandise were sunk or in danger of attack, the President could invoke the discretionary provision of the law by applying the cash-and-carry plan to these commodities. In that case, neither Japan nor China could obtain oil from us except by paying cash for it and transporting it in her own ships. We should then, of course, have no oil tankers in the Yangtze or other Chinese waters. No such incident could occur.

Those who protest that by such action we should be depriving China of essential war resources should remember two important facts. One is that the Japanese army and navy apparently do not intend to allow us to continue to supply China without fighting for the privilege. The other is that we are now sending to Japan the oil and gasoline with which to operate her navy and her bombing planes. We are selling, at a profit, the fuel that makes possible the rape of China and the bombing of hospitals and civilians. Under the Neutrality Act as it stands we could make it extremely difficult for Japan to continue her war. Japan has few tankers, and a rapidly diminishing cash purchasing power. Under a strengthened neutrality law we could stop it altogether. We could do so purely in order to protect our major national interest in remaining at peace, without discrimination among belligerents. Why should we supply to warring nations the resources that enable them to entangle us?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The NAM through the Ages

THE ANNUAL conclave of the National Association of Manufacturers has come and gone, leaving us somewhat sadder but not much wiser. All week the Jade Room of the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City rang with denunciations of labor and the administration as conspirators in the recent murder of business prosperity. Then at the final banquet, President Colby M. Chester extended a friendly hand to the guilty ones: let bygones be bygones, he said, let's all work together "to get the old ship of state back on her keel. . . . Is our program fair, social, constructive? Is it liberal?" Obviously Mr. Chester's 5,000 colleagues thought it was. We must register a reluctant dissent.

Underscoring a traditional primary concern with labor—the one factor of production that stubbornly resists the eternal laws of economics—the country's leading industrialists last week took their stand on an eighteen-plank platform of Employment Relations: collective bargaining, purely a "local" and "internal" affair, is "proper" only when "individual contact between executives and employees becomes difficult"; government should remain strictly neutral, guarding workers from "coercion from any source" but primarily protecting "the right to work"; employers should disregard unions in hiring; no closed shop, no check-off, no compulsory arbitration; government must protect industrial property; government should regulate unions to keep them free of "fraud or coercion"; the Wagner Act should be amended to outlaw nine types of strikes, including the sit-down, sympathetic, general, violent, "quickie," strikes in violation of contract, and—who says capitalists lack a sense of humor?—strikes "to prevent the use of materials, equipment or services"; workers participating in such strikes should be barred from collective bargaining and in effect blacklisted; repeal all anti-injunction laws; make unions and their agents suable without limit; forbid interstate movement of strikers and pickets; and finally, prohibit political contributions "by both unions and business corporations."

Supplementing this design for a return to ancestral caves, the nation's most powerful union of industrialists outlined its idea of sound Employment Procedures, in a statement notable chiefly because it contains no suggestion of the fact that labor unions have something to do with employment policies in 1937.

Perhaps we betray a woeful lack of "perspective" in implying that the manufacturers have failed to keep step with the rest of the country. After all, it's only thirty-four years since this program was formulated. In those days Presidents of the United States spoke softly and used federal troops to break important strikes. Why should we expect epochal events in the interim—the passing of the frontier, the World War, the tremendous growth of monopoly power and practices, the advance of mechanical production, the banishment from our economic society of millions who can't find jobs, the coming of the New Deal, the awakening of organized labor—to upset the considered attitude of those who, in their own words, "are responsible for the welfare of millions. . . ."? Let the mountain come to Mohammed.

Back in 1895, when the NAM saw the light of day, "employment relations" were happily too quiescent to merit attention. Tariff, taxation and trust-busting furnished the headaches then. The rise of the IWW and Teddy Roosevelt's method of settling the anthracite strike of 1902 revealed its true vocation to the Association: ". . . the molding of public opinion . . . to make the wage-earner realize the important truth that his interests and those of his employers are identical; that there is no sense in ruining the enterprise that gives them both their livelihood. . . ."

In 1910, better to bring the light to the "great middle classes," the NAM resolved to place its literature in libraries throughout the nation. A letter from the Los Angeles Public Library brought encouragement: "The Open Shop Encyclopedia has proven so successful in the main library that we would like to have twenty-five copies for our largest branches." America's entry into the War stimulated manufacturers to demand longer hours (fifty hours a week at least), less taxation of business and business men and a funding of the cost of war to let posterity pay it. Their plan for social security ran like this: "It is a moral responsibility of the private employer to encourage, assist and inspire his employees with the importance and necessity of ways and means for making provision for the contingencies of life. . . ."

By 1918 the industrial-conservation movement had become the rage, first as a means of winning the War and then to put America at the top of the heap when it was over. "When the War came with its changes . . . we recognized that patriotism must be the dominant keynote; that it was the duty of everybody, out of patriotic considerations rather than for selfish reasons, to acquire efficiency in industry." The Association demonstrated its patriotism by dropping its fight with labor: "No word of fault-finding have we ever uttered against organized labor. . . . But we have said that labor organizations must turn themselves to the betterment of industry . . . rather than to exploitation. We have talked with them [workers] in appeals to let down the bars of selfish unionism; we have talked to them of the new era of brotherhood."

What did all this come to? Longer hours at higher speed: ". . . not 'how many hours must we labor' but 'how much labor can we put into the hours.' "

The following year brought recommendations for the extension of the piece-work system, laws to make unions "responsible" in court, balancing the budget, lower taxation on "individual initiative"; and a remarkable sermon on the lessons of the War:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If the World War has taught us anything it has taught us the danger of having in our midst un-Americanized aliens and even un-Americanized natives."

Succeeding years have not diminished the altruism of the NAM's motives or the glory of its intellect: there must be no child-labor amendment, no centralized social-security system, no realistic food-and-drug legislation. All these would lead to bureaucracy and the destruction of individual liberty. In 1934 the solons of industry brought forth this puzzler on the question of relief: "Taxpayers' money should not be used in such a way as to encourage or incite strikes, by financing those voluntarily quitting their jobs. Subject to this exception, the existence of a strike should not alter in any way the operation of basic relief principles."

Does the NAM seriously believe that anybody with reasonable intelligence could fail to see through its hypocritical Indian-giving? We think not; its leading spirits must be talking for the benefit of the remainder of the population. The Senate Civil Liberties Committee ought to expose the inner workings of this organization to the public.

Educating the Workers

THE GREAT organizational gains of trade unions in the United States during the past two years have received an enormous amount of publicity, but few people other than those actively engaged in union work are familiar with the progress that has been made in workers' education. The growth of the CIO has brought new impetus to the educational movement because the new labor leaders have shown a better understanding of the vital need for improved educational facilities in building a strong labor movement.

Before 1935 the leading agencies in the field—Brookwood Labor College, Commonwealth College, Highlander Folk School, the Affiliated Schools for Workers, and others—had to depend on non-labor sources for the main share of their incomes. The Workers' Education Bureau, for example, although it was called the "educational arm" of the American Federation of Labor, was receiving from it only $200 a year prior to 1935, and was depending upon the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller General Education Fund for support. During the past two years, however, the yearly contribution of the A.F. of L. to the Workers' Education Bureau was raised to $5,000 and it will be $7,500 for 1938.

Three of the unions which formed the CIO in 1935 had long been active in workers' education: the International Ladies' Garment Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers. The educational department of the ILGWU, which has been in operation for twenty years, has now about 20,000 students enrolled in 553 classes all over the country. Its program for mass education includes popular lectures, moving pictures, musical, dramatic and radio programs. Its list of publications embraces forty items, of which 145,000 were sold and distributed between 1934 and 1936. And similar educational programs, although on a slightly smaller scale, are being undertaken by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers.

The older unions, however, are not alone in giving a strong push to workers' education. The new unions in automobiles, rubber, transport, steel and radio are each devoting a big share of their energies to educational work. The Transport Workers' Union holds classes in the morning, afternoon and evening in order to accommodate its subway, bus and taxi workers whose work-shifts may come at any time during the day or night. The United Rubber Workers are building up an educational fund at the rate of two cents per month from each of their 775,000 members, and have, at present, about $6,000. The United Automobile Workers' union, which is doing outstanding educational work, has allotted five percent of its revenue to an educational fund. About 5,000 of its members are attending the 203 weekly evening classes it holds in sixteen automobile centers in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and Missouri. Like many other unions, the Auto Workers are using teachers from the WPA Workers' Education project. That fact has led to some outraged comment from reactionary commentators, because the CIO has taken the opportunity to obtain WPA teachers to a greater extent than has the A. F. of L. It seems to show, rather, that the CIO unions are more aware of the pressing need for workers' education than is the A. F. of L. Despite the occasional protests from conservatives—who are excited about workers' education merely because it gives them a chance to rant at the CIO—a firm foundation is being laid for educating the mass of workers composing the backbone of the labor movement.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1937, IN THE U. S., BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK.

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors

T. R. CARSKADON OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer

DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No One Shall Starve

THE ADMINISTRATION and Congress are only beginning to sense the weight of the current depression. In a few weeks unemployment will once more be our most acute economic and political problem.

Just how great a disaster has befallen us? It is perhaps too early to tell, for the worst of the factory lay-offs did not come until the middle of November. There has not been time for information about them to be run through the government's statistical mills. However, the predictions of Dr. Leon Henderson of the WPA have been uncannily accurate, and at the end of November he gave as his opinion: "When the figures for the past month have been compiled, they will be found to show a drop in factory employment perhaps twice as violent as that of any similar period in the 1929-33 depression."

Nevertheless, a rough estimate is possible. On December 5, the business-activity index of The New York Times stood at 85.7. The last time it stood at that figure was in the third quarter of 1935. At that time, estimates of the A. F. of L. and of government experts placed the total number of unemployed at about 12,000,000. We may guess that unemployment is close to that level today.

The WPA experts estimate that 1,000,000 factory workers who had jobs on Labor Day in September are now out of work. Probably another 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 are on part time. Increasingly the wages of the part-time workers are dropping to a point insufficient to sustain life.

Getting on the Rolls.—Government experts profess to believe that industry has reached a temporary plateau. They do not expect a great number of new lay-offs, at least for the immediate future. On the other hand, they see no prospect of any considerable reëmployment before next April or May, and an upturn by then is not at all certain.

Nearly 150,000 unemployed workers have been given jobs by the WPA since the first half of October. A month ago, it was widely understood that the government intended to take an additional 150,000 unemployed into the WPA, or a total of 300,000. The 300,000 new reliefers were to be kept on the rolls for only three months, or until the end of March. This program obviously cannot be adhered to. It has been knocked aside by the terrifying onrush of the depression.

How heavy is the full burden likely to be? Workers do not seek public assistance, or even WPA jobs, until they become desperate. The men and women who have been laid off since September have been fighting stoutly to keep their heads above water. Only a few of them, however, will be able to struggle much longer. Experts have found that the number of federal and local relief cases, taken together, stays close to 40 percent of the total unemployed at any given period. If we assume that 12,000,000 represents the present number of jobless, we must expect that the total relief group will soon reach 4,800,000. The average number on federal and local relief since July has been 2,700,000. By January, this figure will almost certainly jump up another 900,000. Because most local authorities are at the last thin edge of their resources, the burden will fall to Washington.

There are many reasons for thinking that the figure of 900,000 is not exaggerated. The experience of the last four years has shown that whenever there is a drop in employment about 70 percent of those thrown out of work eventually need relief. Of the 1,000,000 workers who have lost their jobs since September, therefore, some 700,000 must be considered potential relief candidates. At least another 200,000 will come from the 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 workers now on part time.

Down with Danny-Boy Bell.—The countrywide average WPA wage is about $60 a month. For last September, the exact sum was $57.68. If the WPA is forced to increase its rolls by 900,000 and to carry this number through the rest of the fiscal year, it will mean an additional cost of about $325,000,000. Ever since last July, the square-faced, lynx-eyed director of the budget, Mr. Daniel W. Bell, has been struggling to force the WPA to economize. But despite Mr. Hopkins' best efforts at coöperation, the WPA has not been able to accumulate a reserve. We must have a deficiency appropriation before April.

It is likely to precipitate a sharp conflict within the New Deal. A deficiency bill of this size will kill all hopes for a balanced budget in the current fiscal year. Moreover, about the same time that the deficiency bill comes before Congress, the relief expenditures for 1938-39 will have to be decided on. A short time ago it was reported that Mr. Bell was fighting to hold next year's total relief outlay down to $1,000,000,000. Since the CCC, the Farm Security Administration and several smaller agencies would share in this amount, the WPA could expect no more than $800,000,000, perhaps less. It is feared in Washington that Mr. Bell and the Treasury budget-balancers will oppose both this year's bill and an adequate appropriation for 1938-39.

A Dollar per Day per Family.—This intra-New Deal quarrel, however, is not the worst. There is danger of an attack in Congress on the whole principle of work relief. Under Mr. Roosevelt's general reorganization program, the WPA is to be trans-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lated into a Department of Public Welfare. Senator Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina is in charge of the reorganization program, and he is the WPA's enemy. Last spring he reportedly wanted to confine the proposed Public Welfare Department merely to handing out grants-in-aid to the states. This would mean that work relief would be abandoned, and direct relief by local authorities substituted in its place. This issue is almost sure to be raised, either with the introduction of the relief-deficiency bill or in the debate on governmental reorganization.

It is usually estimated that direct relief costs only about half as much as work relief, that on $30 a month, or a dollar a day, no family will actually die of cold or starvation. Under direct relief, according to the Senate reactionaries, a million additional unemployed could be cared for during the remainder of the fiscal year without the need of voting a penny more. Similarly, the billion-dollar relief total advocated by Mr. Bell would be enough in 1938-39.

With elections coming next November, it seems inconceivable that the members of Congress would be rash enough to defy the workers of the country and do away with the WPA altogether. But they are also under great pressure from business men to "restore confidence," and many of them are formally committed to the objective of a balanced budget. Observers here are afraid that they will try to compromise by keeping the work-relief program at about its present level, while simultaneously voting grants-in-aid to the states to care for the new unemployed. In this way they could perhaps cut in half the expected $325,000,000 deficiency bill, and greatly reduce next year's relief expenditures. By the same act, they would sentence a million families to semi-starvation, disease and hopelessness.

Footnote on the Farmer.—The current debate chiefly concerns the industrial unemployed, but the experts believe that within another month destitution will also appear in many farming districts particularly in the South. No one knows accurately how great the need will be, for last spring, with the approach of the cotton-chopping season, several Southern states quietly closed down their local certifying agencies. Within the last few days, the WPA has acted to set up field offices under the supervision of its own officials in Oklahoma, South Carolina (Senator Byrnes's home state) and Mississippi. Not all of the South's distress comes from the collapse of cotton prices. A year ago, the Cotton Belt made money, and planters apparently bought tractors and other farm machinery on a very large scale. Technological unemployment has arisen—of as yet unknown dimensions. But a confidential survey recently made for the government indicated that 500,000 sharecroppers in the western end of the Cotton Belt are unlikely ever again to have more than a week or two of work in the spring, and three or four weeks at picking time. JONATHAN MITCHELL.

Eddies in National Power Policy

AN INTIMACY through many years with the deep woods of Maine has taught me that interesting features of any good-sized stream are the eddies which punctuate the shore line. Some of them are big and noisy, others quiet and playful and even silent. Time irons out most of them. Rarely are they important enough to divert attention from the sweep of the main stream, and only occasionally after the passage of years does such an eddy make cribbing necessary for the protection of the banks.

So, as through a quarter-century I have watched the sturdy stream of events giving form to what I take to be our national power policy, my interest is directed every once in a while to the eddies along the shore line—"currents moving contrary to the main current." Even those which show signs of turbulence do not disturb me unduly as I summon up once again a picture of the place of power in a social order based on abundance rather than on scarcity, and realize that, without their knowing just why, untold millions stretch their toil-wearied arms toward electricity—cheap, plentiful and widely distributed—as their release from drudgery.

These eddies, these divertissements, in the grand play of mechanical and electrical power, result of course from a wide variety of causes. Perhaps basic to all others is the fact that our technical schools, as well as schools of other types, make only negligible efforts to give their students a really social point of view. After a painstaking inquiry as to their probable interest in public work and their fitness for it, the Rural Electrification Administration recently selected ten student engineers, each of whom was a recent graduate of a different technical school. At one of the first personnel-training sessions they were asked whether an engineer has any social responsibility for his work. Without exception they gave "no" for an answer.

A preponderant percentage of engineering graduates leave their Alma Mater with a deep-seated distrust of public ownership and are all but convinced that our present system of private ownership of utilities really sponsored Franklin's little kite experiment and followed it up with a well-thought-out scheme of electrical development in which Edison and others each had a predetermined part. While we do give the research policies of General Electric and Westinghouse and the outlook and work of Steinmetz and Whitney all possible credit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for American participation in electrical advance, the contribution to electrical progress of our holding companies, and even of many of the operating companies, has been very unimportant.

Again, our engineering societies—which might be expected to be the next line of defense for the public—refuse the helping hand in that they exclude from their discussions of power all references to social policy and even to such a technical subject as costs—especially consumer costs—which after all affords the basic test as to the fairness, and in a way, the effectiveness of the service. Public opinion may be depended upon to clear up these eddies in education and engineering.

When it comes to governmental activities (supported as they are wholly by public funds) one might expect that power policies as indicated by Congress and mapped in detail by the Executive could be kept pretty well in bounds. But first there is the diversion by precedent-setting court decisions, and even socially minded officials are frequently handicapped by precedent-establishing and limiting administrative orders. And then there is the diversion caused by executives less socially minded who attempt to impose their individual interpretations on national policies.

A very interesting series of by-plays is afforded by the Corps of Engineers of the army, a group that normally has charge of engineering developments in rivers and harbors. Actual construction is preceded by surveys, sometimes of individual projects and sometimes of watershed studies, as in the case of the "308 Reports" on which $12,000,000 had been expended prior to the present administration. The Army Engineers have operated under limited legal warrant—especially prior to the TVA decision—for expenditures other than those made as aids to navigation. The legality of federal expenditures for flood control is questioned by some; and as for generation of power, it has been held that there is no constitutional authority permitting it except as a by-product of navigational developments. Even in situations where power might be developed with social advantage, the Army Engineers approach their consideration of such projects in a manner whereby they are likely to go down before estimates based on what the private company operating in the area may be expected to pay for the power or, in some cases, what they say they will pay for it. In making these estimates, the power to be available is usually conservatively rated on the slightest provocation as secondary or "dump." Further, each project is usually rated by itself rather than as one part of a potentially interconnected system. It is altogether possible that a number of projects considered each by itself might furnish nothing but secondary power, although combined they might provide a high percentage of firm power or power to be continuously available.

The Army Engineers only reflect quite common engineering attitudes in resisting not only the concept of an all-inclusive electric-supply system interconnected over wide areas, but also multiple-purpose dams. Engineers still living in a day that is gone hold that a dam constructed for flood-control purposes should never be used for power development. Unquestionably there are some dams designed in the first instance as flood-control mechanisms which should be held to this single purpose. But many of the dams to be built as a part of the impending and critically important campaign to conserve soil and water should be multiple-purpose dams, useful as "aids to navigation" and for flood control and for power development—perhaps also for low-water control, potable-water supply and recreation. Some of the possible economies—power development among them—will be realized only as the public forces a type of engineering that ties in natural resources over wide areas to a common plan. The locations and diversity in types of dams will follow one plan if flood control is the single objective, another if power development is the end sought, and something quite different if the dual purposes of flood control and power development are the objective. After months of debate it took a very direct and positive order from the President of the United States to have tunnels, technically known as penstocks, put in a $14,000,000 PWA navigation and flood-control dam being built by Army Engineers on the Tygart River about eighty miles south of Pittsburgh. This was done in anticipation of the time when power from this source will in all probability be needed, at which time the necessary generating equipment can be installed.

How inevitable are these cross and counter currents is illustrated by the deprecating attitude toward water power as contrasted with steam power in at least two of the reports of the National Resources Committee—an agency in which the President places great hopes. It must be remembered that while under interpretations of the Constitution which have been current it has generally been legally difficult—even hazardous—for the government to undertake to build a hydro-electric plant, the building of a steam plant to generate power for general distribution is strictly forbidden. Or to be more exact, no one would be rash enough to propose such a thing. It is probable that even legislation providing for a steam plant to "firm-up" a government-owned hydro plant would be declared unconstitutional. Private industry, therefore, has always utilized every means at its command to depreciate power generated by falling water—the only type of power legally available for establishing federal "yardstick" control of rates and service.

Now note the following sentences quoted from the National Resources Board Report dated November 28, 1934:

> It is commonly less costly to provide electricity by combustion methods than by harnessing water powers. . . . The advantage in cheapness lies decisively on the side of up-to-date coal, gas or oil plants. . . . Their place [*i.e.*, hydro plants] in the present technical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> scheme is mainly that of a supplementary source, used to carry peak loads for brief periods, while all of the load part of the time and the bulk of the load the rest of the time is carried by the economical fuel burners . . . the remaining sites (hydro of course) are mostly expensive to develop, distant from markets, unreliable in flow, or undesirable in some other respect from the distinctly commercial viewpoint. . . . The value of a water-power project by itself depends upon what it can guarantee in times of low water or after a long drought.

From the standpoint of water power this is really quite a depressing picture. If, as this Report says, the function of water power is "to carry peak loads for brief periods," some of the smartest utility men in the country are in error. I suggest that we page Mr. Taylor of the Philadelphia Electric and Mr. Black of the Pacific Gas & Electric. If only one-fifth of the installed capacity is hydro power, as stated, a good part of this equipment must work pretty continuously, as it has furnished between 35 and 40 percent of the current used by private utilities in recent years. Does anyone contest the low cost of electricity as it is to be serviced from dams on the Tennessee River or from the New York State site on the St. Lawrence River, or from a dozen other smaller and less conspicuous sites? Perhaps individual sentences such as those above, taken with their context of weasel words, can be defended. But if the impression inevitably given the reader is correct, one wonders how the administration can have a power policy except as the all but unwanted child of navigation and flood control.

The eddy represented by Section 1 of "The Production of Power," in the Report directed by William F. Ogburn on "Technological Trends and National Policy," made in June, 1937, to the National Resources Committee, is of an entirely different sort. This paper was apparently drafted under the aegis, if not under the auspices, of the American Engineering Council, the same body which made two reports to President Hoover recommending that Muscle Shoals be turned over to the private companies. Again the thesis that normally water-power costs are higher than steam-generated costs is emphasized. In support of this, George Orrok, an adviser in steam generation to the New York Edison Company and a high priest among coal burners, is confidently quoted. Perhaps most weird, or most amusing, according to how you take such things, are the frequent and confident citations from the publications of the National Electric Light Association and the Edison Electric Institute, and especially the reliance placed on Frank P. Fowle, consulting engineer to the National Electric Light Association from 1920 to its inglorious end about 1932. In The Electrical World for June 20, 1936, under its Table of Contents, we read:

> Here Electrical World presents an abstract of Frank F. Fowle's paper which created widespread interest when presented at the recent Midwest Power Engineering Conference in Chicago. Facts are presented here to show the fallacy of the government's power program by proving that the transmission of remote hydro power is costlier than coal haul.

Fowle's point of view is clearly indicated by the following extract, which I have taken from the conclusion of these abstracts in The Electrical World:

> The best economic remedy which can now be devised is for the government to suspend development of power on all of these projects, and in future develop only so much of the potential power as the private utilities can economically absorb and distribute to the power markets of the country.

How much weight should be given to Mr. Fowle's dicta may be gathered from this statement of the authors of the Ogburn report for which he is cited (see page 259) as the authority: "Under ordinary conditions a steam plant will deliver current at the power-plant bus at 4 mills per kilowatt hour as compared with 6.3 [note the 0.3 as a mark of accuracy] for a hydro-electric plant." This statement is not even dimly factual and has no engineering significance. The authors advocate "discrimination in the development of water-power sites," and while they discuss multi-purpose central stations (electricity and steam), there is no reference to the possibilities of multi-purpose hydro plants. There is no recognition of the social values as contrasted with financial costs in hydro power. At another point we read: "Present practice indicates that it is difficult to render self-supporting rural electric service at a cost which the prospective customers are willing and able to pay." What would a Swedish farmer think of this in view of the fact that about two-thirds of Swedish farms have service, compared with our 16 percent. It hardly looks as if we had reached the saturation point when Business Week (for September 25, '37) reports "Compared with a year ago, electrified farms have increased 32 percent."

The authors hold that "The future power policy of this country must be considered upon a fact-finding basis, without prejudiced passion, and action must be taken slowly and deliberately so as not to hinder progress." Yet throughout, bias is shown by opposition to hydro-power, to competition and to independent plants, and by the unwavering support of large central stations. One is especially surprised at the stress placed upon the point that local generation of power in small units is rapidly disappearing and that the potential uses of the diesel plant are decidedly limited. This was certainly not the corridor talk at the World Power Conference. When I say this report is biased, I mean that the discussion is without vision and perspective and is incomplete, unbalanced and misinforming.

In this connection one would be interested to know the identity of two individuals: first, the one responsible for selecting the auspices under which this particular section was drafted; and second, the individual responsible for not having such a treatise purporting to cover a highly controversial subject

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

checked to detect obvious inconsistencies. There is every internal evidence that this paper was not read by a single authority representing the public side of power; for instance, lawyers, such as McNinch, Lilienthal or Healy; or engineers such as Ross, Scattergood, Pike and Horton; or economists such as Olds, Person, Maltbie and Paul Douglas; or a political scientist such as Judson King.

Is it any wonder that a few days after this report appeared, The New York Times was able to say in its news columns:

> The reaction in utility circles to that part of the report of President Roosevelt's National Resources Committee on "Technological Trends and National Policy" which was devoted to present-day problems surrounding the power and light industry was favorable as well as spontaneous and undivided.

and also to comment in its editorial columns:

> As prophets sociologists are hampered by their lack of technological knowledge and the engineers by their lack of social sense and imagination.

So well pleased is the electrical industry with the report that the Committee of Utility Executives—the same group that sought the defeat of the holding-company bill—has issued a booklet containing quotations from this report "to prove that steam was a cheaper and more desirable source of electrical energy than water power."

MORRIS L. COOKE.

This is the first of two articles on national power policy. The second will appear in an early issue. —THE EDITORS.

Britain Approaches the Führer

THE MISSION of Lord Halifax to Berlin startled Europe and with good reason. The British National Government had so far overcome its habitual inertia and its internal divisions as to take a positive initiative. The explorer might bring back a disappointing report. Nothing might come of any subsequent negotiations. But that the British Government had taken this step toward reconciliation in the eyes of all the world—that might mean a new departure in European politics. To estimate its significance let us look at its antecedents.

Since British policy tamely allowed itself to be defeated by Mussolini in the Ethiopian affair, the closest observers have watched its conduct with bewilderment. Save that it is rearming at great cost, it showed few signs of any rally toward a defensive attitude. No one in the ranks of the Government's supporters would consent even to discuss the strategy of a common front that should include the Soviet Union. It is true that the defensive links with France were tightened, but in return the French had to accept a policy of inaction in Spain that may be fatal to the Republic, while under British influence their alliance with the USSR visibly weakened.

The various diplomatic maneuvers of the Foreign Office (its refusal to recognize the new Roman Empire, the London Neutrality Committee and the Brussels Conference) annoyed the Fascist powers without checking their advance. In effect the British Empire followed a policy of laissez-faire. The spectacle was as humiliating as it was alarming. Three Great Powers, all of them reckless and drunken with success, were advancing arm in arm. Somewhere, some day, if not in the Mediterranean or in the Far East, then in Central Europe, one of them, trading too far on its previous immunity from resistance, would take a step that must confront one of the two Western powers with a choice between war and a fatal surrender. Since British Tories would neither revive the League, nor make common cause with Russia, what was to be done? The only intelligent course was obviously to canalize the expansive energies of the have-not powers, to satisfy their ambitions at least partially by agreement, to buy peace, if possible, without direct loss to oneself.

This formula looks simple, but it had its complications. Must one really satisfy in equal degree the ambitions of Germany, Italy and Japan? And must one treat their alliance (nominally an "ideological" combination against "communism") as a solid and unbreakable bond? To divide these allies was an expedient that naturally arose in the traditional mind of the Foreign Office. For its permanent chief, Sir Robert Vansittart, Germany was still the arch-enemy. His strategy, therefore, was to detach Italy by suitable concessions, and more especially by letting her have her way in Spain. This course Mr. Neville Chamberlain, after some hesitation, approved. It did not prosper. When finally Il Duce joined the "anti-Communist" alliance with Germany and Japan, the chances of breaking the Rome-Berlin axis by detaching Italy looked far from bright.

The rival, pro-German, school of thought now saw its chance. It is a somewhat motley group. It includes Liberals like Lord Lothian, who felt genuine repentance for the follies of Versailles. It has a following in the City, led by Sir Montagu Norman, which obeys other impulses. It can rally class warriors who see in Hitler chiefly the open enemy of the Soviet Union. Finally, through the Astor family, it controls The Times and The Sunday Observer. It has been for some time, through Lord Lothian and others, in close touch with the Führer and General Göring. It has always had its partisans in the Cabinet, who are believed to include Lord Halifax,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Hoare and Sir Kingsley Wood. Of these Lord Halifax, an elder statesman who has been Viceroy of India, is perhaps in the inner circle of the governing class the most influential: his character and his religious outlook rank him with Lord Lothian among the more idealistic members of this variegated group.

The main difficulty in the way of a cordial understanding between British imperialists and the Nazis lay in the comparatively recent adoption by Hitler of the claim for the restoration of Germany's lost colonies. Some few Liberals are ready to consider it and the Labor Party has a plan for bringing the whole of tropical Africa under League Mandate. But Tory sympathy for Hitler was chilled by this campaign: Tanganyika in particular was a field of investment much too valuable to surrender: nor would the Dominions abandon their booty. Generous minds were ready at most to restore the Cameroons, a source rather of loss than of profit.

But how far was Hitler serious in a demand which conflicted with the main argument of "Mein Kampf"? For in the Koran of the Nazi faith the Führer had argued that the chief mistake of the Kaiser lay in challenging British naval power in order to acquire an overseas Empire: he would aim rather at continental expansion. Perhaps when Hitler claimed these colonies he was merely putting pressure on the British Empire to wring from it consent to adventures at the expense of others in a southeasterly direction? Something might have to be done to satisfy the argument from prestige: for that purpose the Cameroons might suffice, with some additions to which the French, the Belgians and possibly the Portuguese (in Angola) must also make their contribution. For the rest, as everyone in London argued, the German colonies were in the economic sense of negligible value: it was, of course, moral considerations that compelled the Empire to retain them. But other fields lay open, notably Austria and Czechoslovakia, to say nothing of Spain. The more Machiavellian members of this school of thought may have reflected that any further German penetration of Austria would strain or break the Rome-Berlin axis. Others reckoned that once in control of Central Europe and the Balkans, Germany would have before her an open road to the Soviet Ukraine.

For purposes of propaganda the press which the Astor family controls skillfully divided the job. The Times, after a lengthy correspondence, broke down the veto on any reconsideration of the colonial question in its leading article of October 28. "Public opinion," it argued, in this matter "is far ahead of the Government." It called for "a genuine attempt to find for Germany some acceptable field for development." It stressed the aspect of prestige: it must be recognized that Germany is *capax imperii*. Tanganyika could not be surrendered, but a field might be found for her elsewhere "by the common accord of three or four of the great colonizing powers with contiguous African territories." To this in its leader of November 29 it added a persuasive yet outspoken argument for the consideration of German claims, political no less than economic, in Central Europe.

Simultaneously, in The Observer, Mr. Garvin, with his customary Celtic exuberance, argued for the satisfaction of Germany's ambitions in Czechoslovakia and Austria. Since Great Britain (as he asserted, and probably with truth) will never actively oppose either the absorption of the latter or the liberation of the German minority in the former, it would be wise to give a positive assent.

The unofficial plan eventually worked out by the Astor group with Hitler's representatives was laid before the Cabinet as a basis for discussion. During the absence of Mr. Eden in Brussels, his colleagues authorized Lord Halifax to go on a voyage of exploration to Berlin. The plan has since been disclosed by The Manchester Guardian, which may have drawn its information from Mr. Eden's friends. This weak man very naturally felt affronted and tendered his resignation, but subsequently withdrew it. The scheme contained an odd feature which Hitler has confirmed in a public speech. Germany will suspend her claim to her former colonies for six years, but at the end of this period of grace the British Government shall support it. It must also concede to Germany a free hand as regards Austria and Czechoslovakia. In return for these very considerable favors, Germany would be pleased to rejoin the League of Nations, but only when the war-guilt clause of the Versailles Treaty is canceled and the sanctions articles of the Covenant abolished. She stipulates also that the Italian conquest of Ethiopia shall be recognized. She also undertook to do her best to promote peace in China and in Spain, but only if the British Government would recognize Franco *de jure*. This summary came, one should remember, from an unfriendly source, and may have given to a series of suggestions a form that seems unduly imperious. Nothing was said about the conclusion of a pact between the four Western Great Powers, nor about an air pact, though these were surely features in the scheme.

What will come of this not very subtle scheme? It seems, if one regards it as barter, a rather unpromising opening. Germany has, indeed, two sops to throw to two groups of her friends. The Tories are assured that they may exploit the German colonies for another six years. The Liberals are dazzled by the prospect of Germany's return to their League. But six years is a short lease, and the League after Germany's return would be as impotent on paper as it is in real life. Of one indispensable clue to the interpretation of the scheme, I confess myself ignorant. Is it designed to break the Rome-Berlin axis by conceding much to Germany, while it grants to Italy only what she has already? That may be its undisclosed purpose. If so, Germany does in fact offer something of value to British policy. She may become this Empire's "brilliant second in shining

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armor," while Italy (bereft of Austria, though in possession of Ethiopia) would be left alone to deal as best she might with Britain and France in the Mediterranean.

One must consider the attitude of the French. It is one of sharp suspicion. They are, however, at the moment rather more hostile to Italy than to Germany. Their enthusiasm for the Franco-Soviet alliance has sunk to zero, since Stalin's purge. But they have recently reaffirmed their obligations to defend Czechoslovakia. From these they will not recede, though whether at all costs they would honor them by actually going to war, without active British support, is more doubtful. Certainly they will not hear of any "free hand" for Hitler, either there or in Austria. This means, I think, that from Downing Street also, through official channels, Hitler will get nothing that approaches "a free hand." On the contrary, he will be told that the United Kingdom will respect all its Treaty obligations, including the Covenant of the League. He is doubtless shrewd enough, after reviewing the cases of Ethiopia, China and Spain, to assess the value of such a pledge to the Austrians or the Czechs. If he should be tempted to overestimate it, he has English friends well able to enlighten him. This is of all possible situations the most perilous. Hitler may feel sure that Britain will not resist him, but he may be mistaken if he assumes that this must also entail French and Russian inaction. No one will explicitly "give" him a free hand, but will anyone effectively oppose him? Probably not, if he goes to work by pressure and intimidation, without an actual invasion.

On the colonial question the French may not be adamant against some compromise. It would cost them little to cede a "token" colony in West Africa to satisfy the claims of prestige. They may offer to meet Germany's real difficulty in procuring raw materials—that she has not foreign exchange with which to purchase them—by a barter scheme. They will take machinery from her for their colonies in return for raw materials. But any colonial offer will be made only in return for some German contribution to European peace, preferably by her consent to a general limitation of armaments.

The test of appeasement is disarmament. Germany will not disarm till she has realized her major purposes, which include her undisputed hegemony over Central Europe. Italy will not do it till she dominates the Mediterranean and controls Spain. Japan will not do it till she possesses northern China and is overlord of the rest. On these terms the British Empire might obtain a wide measure of appeasement for many years to come, if it would add to them its tacit permission at the appropriate moment for a concerted attack on the Soviet Union. To these terms it will not explicitly assent, but neither will it face the only expedients that might avail to check the advance of the Fascist powers.

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

Why Franco Has Hesitated

WHEN General Franco captured Gijon and proceeded to mop up the Asturias region, he announced with confidence that his victorious legions were ready to roll "like an avalanche" over the remaining Loyalist fronts. According to Franco, the Republic was already on the verge of collapse and disintegration.

That was more than seven weeks ago, and the significant fact is that at least up until December 12 the promised knockout has yet to be delivered. (I am not taking too seriously the Rebel claims from Irun over that week-end that three Loyalist fronts have collapsed.) With the Loyalists' northern front eliminated, the expected move for Franco, other things being equal, would have been a quick about-face and a smashing offensive to bring a speedy end to the war.

Today, with military operations on the Aragon front suspended because of intensely cold weather and snow, any large-scale offensive would be most difficult, if not foolhardy. There is some talk of a southern offensive, but that can hardly be considered in the same class as the threatened Aragon drive which was going to cut Valencia and Madrid from Catalonia and the French border.

Why was this "decisive" offensive put off? What made General Franco (or his German and Italian strategists) hesitate, thus giving the Spanish government valuable time to get firmly established in Barcelona, while winter and the rainy season set in? That is a mystery—if you imagine that the Loyalists are cowering in terror before the threatened onslaught of Italian brigades or if you believe the story of William P. Carney in The New York Times of November 29 in which he reports that Franco's intelligence service has discovered "that 80 percent of Madrid's inhabitants and 70 percent of Barcelona's at present are not only ready to quit but are pro-Insurgent at heart." But there is no mystery in Franco's hesitation if you have been in Spain recently, as I was but a few weeks ago, talked with its leaders, and have seen, as I did, the determination and confidence of the people and, most important, the impressive organization and reserves the government now has to call upon.

The fact is that the Rebels actually began preparing the way for their "avalanche" early in November. They began with the technique they have done so much to advertise—the bombing of civilians in defenseless towns behind the govern-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment lines. On All Saints Day, Lerida was bombed and 260 civilians were killed. On succeeding days many more civilians fell victims to the Fascist air raids in other Catalan towns.

This was the formula that had worked so well in the northern provinces—a display of devastating frightfulness to break the morale of the other side. But on the Aragon front something happened to spoil Franco's plans and predictions. For there the Loyalists were able to reply with well directed counter-attacks against military targets and objectives. The Loyalist air force put on a striking demonstration—which, incidentally, received scant notice in the press. They gave Saragossa, the large Rebel city behind the Aragon Front, a terrific bombing, destroying barracks crowded with Mussolini's Black Arrows and Franco's Legionnaires. In addition, an important powder factory was blown up.

It is altogether probable that these surprise government counter-attacks offer the real key to the present situation in Spain. William Forrest, special correspondent of The London News Chronicle, has the following to say of the raid on Saragossa:

> Forty planes took part in the raid. Every one returned unscathed to its base. On succeeding days similar raids were made on other Rebel towns behind the Aragon front, without the loss of a single machine.
>
> The effect was remarkable. Franco's "nine days' war" against the refugee-crowded towns and villages of Catalonia stopped at once. And the big push on the Aragon front, which everyone expected in the first week of November, was postponed.

Clearly these unexpected blows from the Loyalist air force must have compelled Franco to redistribute his own air squadrons.

It is obvious, I think, that Franco now faces an entirely new military situation. He now faces a real army, well equipped, experienced and capable of giving blow for blow. In the successive advances of the Rebels on Bilbao, Santander and Gijon, the Loyalists could offer little more than passive resistance. Those regions were isolated and all but cut off from outside aid. The central government tried to send help, but unsuccessfully. It lost scores of planes in the attempt. It is most improbable that the situation in the Asturias, where Gijon finally fell when the Asturians ran out of ammunition, will be repeated. Moreover, the Loyalist aviation has been extremely active in recent weeks and has succeeded in breaking up heavy Rebel troop concentrations.

From the Loyalist viewpoint, this is perhaps the most encouraging development of the war. Wherever the Loyalists have been able to put up a reasonably adequate defense, the Rebels have failed to gain. There has been considerable talk in the press during past months about "decisive" victories for the Rebels, but the fact is that they have not advanced since last February on any front that was adequately defended and not isolated from all sources of supply. Meanwhile, the Loyalists have put on two impressive and successful offensives—at Brunete and Belchite on the Aragon front.

From a military view, the Loyalists are certainly in a stronger position today than ever before. For the first time since the beginning of the war, they have trained and experienced reserves—around 100,000. These forces are not even in the front lines at present. The army itself now exceeds 600,000 and looks and acts like a real army. It is well equipped and well drilled. In addition, the Loyalists have been organizing war-material factories on a large scale throughout their territory and especially in Catalonia. There are now over 280 war factories in Catalonia alone, and it was largely to increase the output of these, and to build more, that the government decided to move from Valencia to Barcelona.

Offsetting these favorable developments, to be sure, are the restrictions of the Non-Intervention Pact and the needless application of our own Neutrality Act, which have undoubtedly handicapped the Loyalists severely.

There has been considerable talk of late, by correspondents no closer to the Loyalist scene than Hendaye, London or Paris, intimating that the Loyalist cause is all but lost. Mr. Frederick T. Birchall, for example, cables The New York Times from Paris on November 28 solemnly observing that "The Spanish problem has become almost negligible because Generalissimo Francisco Franco is settling that, and all that remains is to ensure that his approaching domination does not go to his head. . . ." This is very interesting and would be even more so if Mr. Birchall were to offer concrete evidence of the "approaching domination." Likewise there has been talk suggesting that the Loyalists were so downhearted that they might accept a truce, including the restoration of the monarchy. It was even reported that General Franco was postponing his big offensive so as not to jeopardize the chances of such a truce. These rumors, of course, were promptly scotched by Premier Negrin, who declared, "All talk of an armistice from our side is nonsense."

There can be but one purpose, I believe, behind this concerted campaign on impending Loyalist doom. It is to discourage support for an allegedly "lost" cause among the democracies and perhaps to excuse their do-nothing policy. None can be blamed for not backing a losing horse. However, such propaganda, whatever its effects elsewhere, has none at all in Loyalist Spain. A people that has been fighting against tremendous odds to repel a Fascist invasion and preserve its own democracy is not likely to be in a mood to compromise on a monarchy.

And while many people outside of Spain seem to think that the war is nearly over, the Loyalists have a different conviction. They know it is just about to begin. They know, too, that after seventeen months of hostilities, they are in the best position they have ever been to meet the Fascist aggressors. From now on it can be safely predicted that they will not hesitate to take off the kid gloves whenever necessary, as they did at Saragossa.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Stockwells of Minneapolis

ALMOST everyone in Minneapolis and Saint Paul knows the S. A. Stockwells. Many plain folks downstate do too. But outside of Minnesota they are not so well known. That is partly because they have been too busy at home to travel and partly because they don't seek publicity.

Doubtless they have as many enemies as friends, perhaps more. And maybe those enemies raised an eyebrow one morning last spring when they opened their newspapers and read of the banquet given Mr. and Mrs. Stockwell by 1,000 friends in commemoration of "fifty golden years of valuable service to mankind." The Governor of Minnesota was the principal speaker. Knowing the modesty and simplicity of the Stockwells, knowing the many unpopular causes they have fought for year in and year out, this public recognition of two fine people seemed almost too intelligent to be true.

The first time I met Mr. Stockwell he was in the barn in his bare feet milking the cow. He sat there on a milking stool, a thin wiry man with blond hair brushed off his forehead, deepset blue eyes under shaggy brows looking at me a little amused. I could tell he was reading me like a book. He knew that I was fussed and at the same time ashamed of being fussed, meeting him like that, a state Representative, milking a cow in his bare feet. I was a conventional city girl and pretty young at the time, but even though I was embarrassed I had the sense to know I was meeting a rare personality.

The Stockwell farm had once been away out in the country but now the town was creeping up on it bit by bit and working people were building small houses all around. But Mr. Stockwell kept right on with his cow and garden. He and Mrs. Stockwell always believed in simple, austere living; their ambitions centered on what they could do for their state and for humanity, not for themselves. Every fall at harvest time the Stockwells had a corn festival. Those parties have been an institution for years. The guests are the cream of the Twin Cities, not the people whose names appear in the society columns of The Minneapolis Journal and The St. Paul Dispatch, but people who have ideas and ideals and are doing things for their communities.

Mr. Stockwell has dignified the term "politician" by the kind of service he has rendered both in the Minnesota House of Representatives, where he has served during thirteen sessions and where he is still a member, and the state Senate, where he served during two sessions. He is a liberal and a loyal disciple of Henry George. As such he has fought for progressive measures in his state, especially those which have had to do with returning the great natural resources of Minnesota to the people.

In his first session in the House in 1891 he introduced and saw enacted into law an anti-Pinkerton bill. While senator in 1899 and a member of the rules committee he fought successfully a resolution calling for unequal pay of white and Negro janitors and caretakers for the same work. Later on he championed the cause of a Negro girl who had been refused admittance to the Minnesota University Hospital for nurses' training because of her race. With local aid Mr. Stockwell compelled the University to admit the girl. She is now superintendent of a training school for nurses in New Orleans. Several Negro girls have since taken the nurses' training course at the University.

Mr. Stockwell has always been a consistent and hard-working pacifist. In the late nineties he was one of the organizers and first president of the Anti-Imperialist League of Minnesota, and he organized numerous mass meetings to protest the entrance of the United States into the Spanish-American War. In 1916 he made speeches and organized meetings opposing the entrance of the United States into the World War. He helped the People's Council—a body whose chief objective was to have President Wilson proclaim the real reasons for our entering the War and the probable terms of settlement. Those were bitter days for pacifists. The Stockwells were attacked and persecuted unmercifully. Threats were made to paint their home yellow and to tar and feather Mr. Stockwell; superpatriots tried to have him arrested on the charge of being a German spy and a traitor to his country, —all without effect.

During the famine in Russia he was treasurer of a local branch of the Friends of the Soviet Union and worked for months collecting funds and supplies. When Sacco and Vanzetti were being tried, he organized meetings and raised funds up to the last minute, hoping to see justice done. Often now as in the past he acts as bondsman for men unjustly imprisoned during labor troubles or threatened with deportation. When free speech is in danger at the University of Minnesota or in less intellectual circles it is to S. A. Stockwell that people in the Twin Cities turn.

In Minneapolis they talk of the Stockwells as a unit, for one thinks of them always as fighting the good fight together. Yet Maud Stockwell has had her own separate work in the community. Years ago she took up the fight for the enfranchisement of women and pursued it tirelessly. When that battle was won she turned her energies to the crusade for world peace, and she is still fighting.

The Stockwells are in their seventies now and last fall celebrated their golden-wedding anniversary, which children, grandchildren and friends attended. They have decided to sell the farm and move farther into the city—not to lay down the cudgels, but to conserve their energy for the causes in which they believe. Minnesota is fortunate in the possession of Maud and Sylvanus Albert Stockwell.

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER.

This portrait won second prize in The New Republic's "Little Known Fighters for Civil Liberties" contest.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

Advertising and the Free Press—When's a Neutral Not a Neutral?—Advertisers and Publishers Make Good Bedfellows

CYNICS have said that American newspapers have lost idealism and that nothing is sacred to the daily press. The charge is quite unfounded. The publishers are united in a strong religious faith and they worship a bright and burnished calf. They bow in reverence when the Great God Advertising is mentioned and they will allow none to take his name in vain.

Recently a judge in Brooklyn granted an injunction placing certain limitations on secondary picketing. The case concerned the Eagle strikers and a beauty shoppe which advertised in that paper. Some New York papers have given scant news coverage to this labor dispute. Indeed The Eagle itself, vociferous champion of a free press, had assumed the privilege of suppressing all mention of the strike in its own columns. In the judgment of The New York Times, the happenings in Brooklyn have decided news value. It has carried numerous stories of the strike. The Eagle was brazen in its betrayal of the integrity of the news. Seemingly its slogan might be, "All the news which isn't disturbing to Mr. Goodfellow."

But even that ironically named publisher put aside his reticence as to the story on his doorstep as soon as an advertiser was concerned. Scratch an advertiser and all the publishers come buzzing out of the hive. Captain Patterson of The News does not see eye to eye with The Times or The Herald Tribune. On many occasions he has taken his fellow publishers severely to task. Specifically, he has done a grand job of cracking down on them as one of the allied groups that sabotage the abolition of child labor. But when it came to the question of the advertiser, Patterson rushed into the same pew as Sulzberger and Reid. The advertiser is always right.

I am sure that no joint editorial was written. It was merely the coincidence which frequently brings great minds into the same channel. There was unconscious unity and all the editorials used the same arguments. There was possibly some slight difference in the language. The argument ran that it was unjust for strikers to picket an advertiser because he had no stake in the dispute and was wholly neutral.

As a matter of fact, the advertiser supplies the sinews of war. He is just about as neutral as a munitions ship loaded with shrapnel. Even when circulation has been cut, a publisher can fight on indefinitely as long as his advertising revenues remain undiminished. And, indeed, the advertiser who sticks to the ship after most of the readers have fled shows very palpably that he is taking sides. It is bad business to advertise at the old rates in a curtailed medium. If the advertiser continues to come in, he does so because he believes it is good politics for him to support the employer. He is definitely taking a side against labor.

In one of the Guild strikes I called on the head of a large department store and asked him to cut or remove his advertising from the paper which was fighting the union. He refused, and he was quite frank in giving his reasons. "It is undoubtedly true," he said, "that our advertising in the paper at the present time is doing us no good. I've checked up myself and the Guild's claims as to circulation cuts are accurate. It may even be true that the store is taking on a certain amount of ill will from various groups in the town because we string along with the publisher. But I hope I'm talking to a realist and not a young romantic. This has not been a union town and we would prefer to see it remain open-shop. If the Guild wins the strike, presently my own employees will be asking for collective bargaining. Sure it's a war and I know which side I'm on. I'm on the side of the publisher."

And I think that, generally speaking, the department-store man expressed with accuracy the psychology of the advertiser who sticks to the struck paper. Naturally I am not contending that the advertiser has no legal rights whatsoever, but it seems to me fallacious to regard him as a non-combatant in a labor war. He is neutral neither in word nor deed. Moreover, taking the American press and the advertiser in mass, it is fiction to assume that he merely buys space and exercises no control over the editorial or news policies of the media he uses. I am quite ready to venture the opinion that there are newspapers in America where the voice of the advertiser is never heard in the editorial department. Well, to be more precise, I'd rather say almost never. But surely no one can deny that there are many publications which are dominated in whole or in part by the advertiser.

The campaign of Bruce Barton for Congress was highly significant. Here The News should get four stars because it endorsed Mr. Barton's opponent, George Backer, and did not go into somersaults in giving over its news columns to Mr. Barton's press agent. In greater or smaller degree the rest of the New York press put itself out to do honor to the head of a large advertising agency which might have favors to distribute. I will admit that in some cases the line was hard to draw. I don't want to be captious, for it is quite true that Mr. Barton's candidacy had legitimate news value. Still, there was no bending over backward on the part of newspaper editors and I am not convinced that a three-column cut was in order every time Bruce Barton patted an underprivileged child on the head. Nor did it seem to me that his "life story," which was eagerly snapped up, represented what would ordinarily be considered red-hot news. At the very least it is not an overstatement to say that Mr. Barton's connection with the advertising business didn't give him any the worst of the breaks when he wanted news space.

I would also suggest to the reader who thinks that his own favorite newspaper is wholly free from any suasion by advertisers to make one specific test a year. Wait until the automobile show comes to your city or town and then read the news columns. You will find even the so-called scrupulous sheets giving whole columns to the fact that some new model has a special kind of trick cigarette lighter. That is puffery and it isn't news.

So if an advertiser gets his toes stepped upon during a newspaper strike, the labor group may quite justly ask him to wear a red carnation or some other distinguishing mark. There are times even in bright daylight when it is impossible to tell the advertiser from the editor.

HEYWOOD BROUN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

What's Wrong with Housing?—Mr. Eccles' Beliefs —Budget Battle Called—Shall Anyone Mediate in Santo Domingo?

MR. MARRINER S. ECCLES of the Federal Reserve System has lately become one of the closest White House advisers, a circumstance that troubles many liberals. Because of a statement issued last spring, Mr. Eccles has had the reputation of being hostile to union labor. Many liberals are afraid that his influence will serve to worsen the already damaged relations of Mr. Roosevelt and the CIO. The best judges do not consider Mr. Eccles closer to Mr. Roosevelt than Mr. Hopkins, Secretary Wallace, Secretary Morgenthau, Mr. Kennedy, Professor Merriam or Mr. Corcoran, but he is definitely in the innermost ring.

The sudden prominence of Mr. Eccles comes from Mr. Roosevelt's adoption of the housing program on which he and his assistant, Mr. J. M. Daiger, worked for nearly three years. The housing message to Congress, last month, is supposed to have been largely their handiwork. Liberals pointed out that it listed high wages for building labor as one of the chief obstacles to building. The message argued for reduced hourly rates, to be compensated for by larger annual pay. This section was sharply condemned by the heads of the A. F. of L. building-trades unions.

Mr. Eccles has not attempted to defend himself. As head of the country's monetary system, he is said to feel that part of his duty is to talk as little as possible. His associates, however, resent the accusations against him, and from their explanations one can piece together a statement of his beliefs. Mr. Eccles seems to believe that workers ought not ask for wage increases while unemployment remains unsolved. This is an oversimplification, but it is the conclusion toward which his thinking points. According to his associates, he believes that production is the test of a country's health—the theory associated here with Professor Moulton and Brookings Institution. Anything that chokes off production is necessarily bad. Increased wages mean increased prices, which in times like these mean lessened production. Therefore, no strikes and wage demands.

Mr. Eccles' associates go to great pains to stress that this is merely a temporary rule, which will cease to have validity as soon as unemployment is absorbed. Once the country begins to produce at something like capacity—once money and workers are fully employed—he would heartily support increased wages. He believes profoundly that workers should have a far greater share of the national income. He deplores the too-rapid capital creation of the Coolidge-Hoover era. But first the national income must be expanded.

It is further explained that Mr. Eccles' animus is not against the industrial unions of the CIO—at least to the extent that they comprise badly paid and unskilled workers —but against the A. F. of L. craft unions. Like all New Dealers, he is a bug, or nut, on housing. He is represented as feeling that the jurisdictional quarrels of the building-trades unions, together with their wage demands, have been an important cause of the failure of private capital to enter the housing field.

A good deal of Mr. Eccles' supposed feeling is doubtless justified. But it should be noted that other New Deal leaders, particularly those who are pushing Mr. Roosevelt to make monopoly the issue of next year's campaign, have a very different emphasis. They say that labor is only one element in housing, and that a relatively severe cut in building wages would not greatly reduce costs. The real villains are the price-fixing trade associations of the building-material companies. They say it is unfair to attack building wages until the government has moved to lower prices in steel, cement, plumbing supplies, fabricated roofing and a long list of other products.

The great battle of the budget will not take place. The depression means lower tax receipts, and probably means that the federal government must care for an additional million unemployed. The deficit for the present year, instead of being the $600,000,000 that Mr. Roosevelt promised in his October budget message, will be nearer a billion. Next year's budget, the 1939 budget, if it is in any degree realistic, will show a further great deficit. Within the last few days, most of the budget-balancers within the New Deal seem to have accepted this, and given up. Mr. Eccles, who six months ago wanted not merely to balance the budget but to begin actual debt retirement, told a congressional committee last week that early balancing was impossible. Secretary Morgenthau will probably be the last to surrender, but there is little doubt that he will loyally accept whatever decision Mr. Roosevelt takes.

White House advisers are now debating the manner in which another year of deficit financing is to be presented to the country. A minority would like to have Mr. Roosevelt announce the news proudly, and with a bang. Their arguments are much the same as those given for pump-priming four years ago. Right now, they say, big and little corporations, great capitalists and shoestring speculators, are scrambling for liquidity, just as in 1929-33, and primarily this means they are paying off debts. If the government likewise tries to pay off its debts, or at least not to contract new ones, the downward spiral will be immensely accelerated. According to this group of White House advisers, if Mr. Roosevelt last October had announced that the administration did not intend to permit a depression, and would put purchasing power in the hands of consumers to whatever extent was needed, he would have paradoxically terrified investors back into optimism.

Few observers, however, believe that Mr. Roosevelt will follow this course. What seems almost sure is that the administration will continue to promise a balanced budget, while privately consenting to necessary spending. Mr. Roosevelt's recent message to Congress urging a cut of $113,000,000 in federal road funds is pointed to as an example of the method that will be followed. The New Dealers are not naïve enough to believe that Congressmen would vote a cut in road money in an election year. The purpose of the message was to permit Mr. Roosevelt to tell the country that he had tried to economize, but dat ol' debbil Congress refused to coöperate. This maneuver is highly praised by White House advisers who would be horrified if Congress actually did reduce spending. To this department, it seems of a piece with the trickiness that has already vitiated large areas of the New Deal.

Washington. T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other People's Money

The Cement Trust Mixes F.O.B. and S.O.B.— A Little Dissertation on "Trading"— How to Wangle Good Will

HERE IS a little story about the gentle art of pulling wool over people's eyes. Back in the good old days of the NRA, the federal government began spending a lot of money on hastily improvised improvements of all kinds. It is the money, by the way, which unbalanced the budget and about which ponderous business men trouble themselves a good deal.

One of the principal beneficiaries of this money was the cement trust. About this time Governor Horner of Illinois wrote to the Secretary of the Interior calling attention to the fact that the cement companies were gouging the government through use of the famous "basing-point" system. It is a system by which competitors are able to make uniform price agreements effective so that the man who buys a barrel of cement ten miles away from the cement works will pay the same price on it as if he were a thousand miles away. Long-haul freight charges are figured in, even though the shipper does not pay that freight. Governor Horner wanted to buy cement from the companies and pay an f.o.b. price. The cement trust, however, insisted on what might be called s.o.b. prices.

Secretary Ickes turned the Governor's letter over to President Roosevelt, who sent it to Barton W. Murray, deputy administrator of the cement code. The President instructed Murray to wire the Cement Institute to see what could be done about the complaint. Murray wired to the chairman of the Code Authority, Mr. B. H. Rader, urging the Code Authority to deal with the problem. But Mr. Rader replied that nothing could be done about it and that they would like to have an audience with the President to present the case to him.

In that telegram Mr. Rader pointed out that the cement industry "for a long time endeavored to arrive at a method which at all times and in all markets would protect the using public and prevent monopolistic tendencies." The method, of course, was this uniform price, which included a lot of freight rates never paid. The aim, of course, was to do away with competition and to set up a monopoly. But Mr. Rader, using the well known technique of trade propagandists, spoke of it as designed to prevent monopolies.

All this is merely a prelude to a letter which I present in full and which in my humble judgment is more important than any book of 350 pages that has appeared on this subject of monopoly in many years. On the Cement Institute, which is, in fact, the cement trust, was a man by the name of John Treanor. He was one of the leading figures in the cement industry, president of a large cement corporation and an official of the Cement Institute. When he heard about the Horner-Ickes-Rader incident, he sat down and wrote a letter to Mr. Rader. This letter has just come to light in the Federal Trade Commission investigation of the cement trust. Here it is:

Dear Bud:

I have been thinking about your telephone call, from which I get the impression that you sent a pretty unyielding telegram to Murray—as you say at least that you "did not intend to make any concession before the 'trading' starts."

Now I would have conceded the mill price at once on federal business and I would have indicated a very open-minded attitude toward the larger question; and this to create the impression, deliberately, that something besides construction and short-range trading can be had out of the cement industry. I would have taken advantage of this great opportunity to lay a telegram on the President's desk which he would have read. We know he is watching the cement question. I would have tried to strike a new note of coöperation and reasonableness, in contrast with what Ickes and the Federal Trade Commission tell him about us. This could have been the beginning of a real campaign, for that is why I am writing you. The only thing that I think has been lost is a neat opportunity to score our point with the President himself.

As a member of this industry, my fate is to a considerable extent in your hands, so that I have both a right and a duty to let you know my views.

If we were a generally well regarded industry, we might be justified in taking a stiff trading position upon the President's request. However, we are anything but popular, we have a very difficult position to maneuver out of, and we should not gamble unnecessarily, running as we do the risk of a blast from the President's office that may be ruinous.

The f.o.b. mill price on federal business is of no real importance, is entirely practical to grant, can and I think will be forced out of us—therefore good trading would have been given to give it without any trading.

Now, when it comes to the larger question of mill price on commercial business, much as I would like to think otherwise, I am convinced that we will have to maintain our basing-point position and refuse the President's request. It will not be an easy refusal to defend upon economic grounds. It will be almost impossible to persuade an unsympathetic government that we are justified in our refusal. But the least we can do is to prepare the way by an initial showing of open mindedness, which might entitle our later argument to sympathetic hearing.

Do you think any of the arguments for the basing-point system, which we have thus far advanced, will arouse anything but derision in and out of the government? *I have read them all recently. Some of them are clever and ingenious. They amount to this, however: that we price this way in order to discourage monopolistic practices and to preserve free competition, etc. This is sheer bunk and hypocrisy. The truth is of course —and there can be no serious, respectable discussion of our case unless this is acknowledged—that ours is an industry above all others that cannot stand free competition, that must systematically restrain competition or be ruined.* [Italics mine. J.T.F.] We sell in a buyers' market all the time. The capital cost, as distinguished from out-of-pocket cost, of producing cement is extraordinarily large. In free competition this capital cost is whittled away and this means loss and ruin.

Now an industry in this fix needs some sympathetic understanding on the part of the government. I think our case can be made out, but it is not going to be done by the route of hard-boiled short-range trading. We are either dealing with a very important large question of public relations or we are not. If we are not, we don't

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to be so careful of our methods. If we are, then we had better approach the question in a large way; and the first approach is to acquire some good will in government quarters. All that we need for our reasonable prosperity is consistence with the President's original plan for NRA.

I haven't seen the telegram you sent. This letter may be unwarranted and is pretty sure to make you sore, but it is based upon your remark about "trading" and upon some general views of industry policy which I heard advanced by some of the very influential men of our industry. Yours truly, John Treanor.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Winter Garden and Siege

Hooray for What! Book by E. Y. Harburg, Howard Lindsay and Russel Crouse. Lyrics by E. Y. Harburg. Music by Harold Arlen. Winter Garden, November 30, 1937.

Siege, by Irwin Shaw. Longacre Theatre, December 8, 1937.

MORE opinions differed some years ago than now as to Mr. Ed Wynn's merits. I remember seeing him, it must be twelve seasons back at the very least, during the epoch when he was "The Perfect Fool," top-hatted, tall, slim, perhaps meant to be stylish. As humor it seemed to me wisecracking, forced and tedious; as clowning it had not arrived, but was merely a being-funny business that ran toward over-effort and greed for applause. About five seasons ago I saw him again, with more of the dutiful on my part than expectation of pleasure. But the moment turned out a happy one, warmed with the satisfaction of seeing a performer who had grown into his own proper capacity, which might so easily have been missed, and had flowered into security, relaxation and a certain charm and kindly abundance. What had been smarty or punched up had broadened into a genuine humor; the performer gave rather than asked; and a stage movement of his own had been developed, with its own rhythm and clowning.

All that has now in Mr. Wynn's current performance been further blessed. After five years' absence from the stage, he comes strangely enough from the invisible craft of the radio with a complete stage pattern that never misses its effect. His scene, for instance, with the dogs, as they appear in first one size and then another, and one inclination, favor or resentment, is a study in variety of pose and response. There is also his performance seen as clowning. As clown he has now what is, I imagine, first of all the basic clown motif and appeal: the giving of yourself to life; life invites you, you respond; it flattens you, you are cluttered and muffed into defeat, at the very next call you are at it again; and so on and so forth. You have a heedless abundance; you are the agent of a kind of whimsical triumph of life. Consider this point with some of the great clowns we may have seen, the Fratellini for example, and supremely the one supreme theatre invention of our time, the Charlie of Mr. Chaplin.

The producers of "Hooray for What!" have been discerning enough to allow for ways changing in the theatre as elsewhere. Messrs. Shubert have allowed this show to take its course under the hands of Mr. Vincente Minelli, giving him leeway as a representative of these changing ways and needs. At any rate you have only to compare this evening with what were once classified as Winter Garden shows to see what has happened. There is, in the first place, a story with more point and somewhat more continuity—or shall we say scope for continuity or possibility of it? The story is that Inventor Wynn has a genius for gases, joyous or deadly; he is seized upon by the industrialists; through him they may go further into the fomentation of costly wars. In the end his gas masterpiece, read in a mirror by the spy who stole it, is used backwards and instead of killing whole armies sets them off into laughter and brotherly love. As it stands, this motif has been shaken down a good deal into a stage line. It could, of course, be carried further, but strings out pretty well.

The same changed trend appears in the décor for which Mr. Minelli has been given a free hand. We have here a young designer with divers productions already to his credit—at Radio City Music Hall, the "Follies" that succeeded the late Flo Ziegfeld, "Du Barry," "At Home Abroad," and so on—who shows himself to be easily one of the most promising people in our theatre. The fact that Mr. Minelli both staged and supervised this production as well as designing the settings would suggest that his tendency is to start with the whole entertainment and to come only later to the visible embodiment of it. That is to say the décor comes last, and evolves from the whole theatre matter on hand. It would not so much obstruct or overpower, but rather would fill out or carry and enliven, as music does. It emerges with a certain spontaneity and freedom; and might be taken as a part of the show's natural life, or power, or shine, or even the fun of it, as the case may be—always assuming, of course, that the artist commands the technique of décor, ready for use.

This seems to me the only sound end for theatre design. The fact that one man can be behind the décor, as contrasted with the numbers of people and divers mediums concerned with the rest of a theatre work, gives the dècor side of it a wonderful but dangerous position. In this new Winter Garden production we have dècor that comes from the same hand that staged and worked over the piece itself. And this may be partly the reason why this general audience, buzzing with enthusiastic and jolly anticipations, takes without batting an eyelash the most sophisticated designing, even to that purplish scene in wild baroque, with its Bernini-like statue, all whirls and lovely postures, as far from nature as baroque can get, but very beautiful as sharing the life of the scene. The audience not only took the décor, they applauded it; and even the simplest of them sniffed something that richly bucked them up.

This application by so gifted a designer as Mr. Minelli of the extravagant plenty and decorative emotion of the baroque to musical comedy is a fine thing. Baroque design can be as wayward as you like and at the same time maintain a certain continuity throughout. And the true intuition of the baroque can be an enviable basis for designing in other styles. The advantage of musical comedy, taken seriously, as compared with other kinds of theatre, is in its wayward freedom and its invitation to all the styles.

For the songs we may say that though the audience in the intermission and exits did not seem to be drenching the lobby with them, they found them well enough. Mr. Paul Haakon was delightful in his own special style for his first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number, "Life's a Dance." In the ambitious "Hero Ballet" he was merely pretty, his talent, and perhaps his Fokine technique, does not include the dramatic. But even here the affection he draws from audiences stood by him.

"Siege," by Irwin Shaw, whose short play, "Bury the Dead," had such unforgettable moments, presents a group of Loyalist soldiers marooned in a Spanish fortification. Whatever merits its dialogue has lie in a certain combination of spontaneous effects, etc., that require an immediacy and closeness that Mr. Chester Erskin's directing, under Mr. Norman Bel Geddes' supervision, defeats, as do Mr. Geddes' insistent settings. An unfortunate occasion.

Meanwhile a few more or less tentative performances have been given of "The Cradle Will Rock," Mr. Marc Blitzstein's opera that the Federal Theatre once considered producing. The relation of the theme to the labor problem —to be particular, steel unionization—made the production inadvisable. It is now the first item in the Mercury's Worklight Theatre project, by which works not placed get a chance to be heard. There are high expectations for the piece when it goes into full production.

STARK YOUNG.

The Abbey Players (this time just an Irish stock company, moderately successful on Broadway for over two months) did well on O'Casey's "Plough and the Stars," holding it together by their personal force and knowledge as a company. They seem to have done the opposite for his "Juno and the Paycock." Outside of a rich vein of genuine comedy in character, O'Casey is weakened by a tendency to overripeness in melodrama and "writing," and by a certain dramatic discontinuity. In this he can be made or marred by his company. And the current "Juno" has been put on wrong from original casting to the final motion, against a background of perfunctory road-company sets: cues are retrieved slowly, speeches drag, entrances and exits are so ill timed that their mechanics become evident; dull moments start the audience off into its eternal nasty habit of chatter and buzz.

Thanks for a lovely evening go to the people of the Labor Stage production (Thirty-ninth Street, east of Broadway), "Pins and Needles." The New Republic representative who caught the show got in late and grumpy, found the first few numbers heavy, and kept muttering that this didn't look like a stage production but a meeting of garment workers. The joke was on the representative, because they turned out from the program to be actual workers in the ILGWU, and from the balance of the evening to be troupers with an infectious amount of verve and wit. Possibly one reason for confusion was the fact that comedy black-outs and songs were sandwiched with group-dance routines of sober import, and the dances were not always well enough done to overcome the natural belief that the parody of the previous number was still going on. Harold J. Rome did the work of a major in writing practically all the words and music and playing one of the accompanying two pianos in the pit. The music sufficed without being outstanding, a composite of musical phrases, some catchy. But "F. T. P. Plowed Under" is at about the top of hilarity for a sketch; the lyrics (*e.g.*, those for the Lorn Vassar Girl) have not been equaled for a long time; and as for the audience, it helped as much as anything by catching on at every point and falling out of its chairs. (P. S. Until Christmas, when their production goes onto a professional Broadway basis, the garment workers only perform on Friday evenings and Saturday matinée and evening.) O. F.

The Bandwagon

The idea that the laborer has a right to his job is another vicious notion.—*Lewis Haney, Professor of Economics at New York University, in a speech before the National Industrial Council, as reported in The New York Times.*

Labor Economics. Labor Economics is found in the 330.01 group [Dewey decimal coding used in public libraries] but books by Karl Marx and about Karl Marx are also found in this section and are not applicable to the subject.—*From Employment Service Practices, the manual of the California State Employment Service.*

Nowhere but at Schrafft's will you find such holiday treats. Nowhere but at Schrafft's will you find each dish of your Thanksgiving dinner so lovingly prepared, by women who are in many cases mothers themselves. . . . —*From a news note on the menu of Schrafft's restaurants, New York City.*

JOIN THE PRIESTHOOD AND SEE THE NEXT WORLD

I have never had the opportunity of meeting Hitler, but there is no doubt he has done fine things. Of course there are some sore spots, such as his religious persecution. But he is so clean morally that he could probably qualify for the priesthood.—*Dr. Norman W. Cameron, former president of West Chester Teachers' College, quoted in The Newark, N. J., Evening News.*

BLESSED BE THE GREASEMAKERS

In an amended report to the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year 1935, the Standard Oil Company of Kansas told of a resolution granting a bonus to all employees equal to federal income taxes upon their salaries. Under this resolution, C. B. Wrightsman, president, received a cash bonus of $7,476.—*From a news item in The New York Times.*

DISCRIMINATION!

Concealment of epilepsy is not ground for annulment of marriage (254 N.Y. 73; 249 A.D. 658; 179 A.D. 343).

Skoutelas-Skoutelas, Supreme Court, Kings County, Justice Conway, Law Journal 10/14/37, page 1,149.

Defendant's refusal to be confirmed as a member of the High Episcopal Church, in accordance with agreement made before his marriage to plaintiff, constitutes sufficient fraud to annul the marriage. Court cannot disregard plaintiff's uncontradicted testimony if it is not inherently unbelievable. (25 N.Y. 361.)

Sankey-Sankey, Supreme Court, Westchester County—Justice Morschauser, Law Journal 10/14/37, page 1,152. —*Two items appearing, in the order given, in the New York Law List.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

A Vote for "Collective Security"

SIR: This morning's paper announces the final futile act of the Brussels Conference. The nations of the Nine Power Treaty have managed to keep the record straight verbally, but they have done nothing to implement their sympathy for China. It is also clear that the unwillingness of the United States to take initiative in the conference has played an important part in its failure. The result at Brussels has further weakened the democratic and peaceful forces of the world and has also enhanced the prestige of the aggressive Fascist powers. The outcome will also lower the morale of the Chinese people.

The editors of The New Republic have some responsibility in this connection. From the beginning of the Sino-Japanese conflict you have opposed positive action on behalf of China. You vigorously condemned President Roosevelt's Chicago speech—characterizing his views as "dangerous" and "tragic." Apparently you would have been happier if the Nine Power Conference had never been called. I should judge that you must be relieved that it ends without involving the United States in any program to help China, or to oppose Japan.

I know that I speak for many of your readers when I say that your position on this problem has both perplexed and disappointed us. Now that Brussels has ended, and with it the immediate danger of the United States getting manipulated into a war, do you not owe it to your readers to set out in more systematic and comprehensive form the considerations which have led you to adopt this policy? As some of us understand your position, we find certain difficulties in the logic by which it is supported. Many, I am sure, would like further light on points such as follow.

1 What is your conception of national interest? The following excerpt from one of your editorials would seem to imply that imperial and trade interests are the only crucial national concerns:

> There is nothing in the Far Eastern situation that warrants the entanglement of this country. We have no imperial ambitions in that area. We have agreed by act of Congress to set the Philippines free. Our investments are so small in toto that it would be far cheaper for us to buy out their American owners than to fight, even for a few weeks, in their defense.

Is the above to be taken to mean that the maintenance of the integrity of China has no significance for the United States? Do you believe that if Japan conquers China and makes her a vassal State our security and international position will not be impaired? If so, eleven years of residence in the Far East gives me a different view of the long-run consequences of these events.

2. You have urged the invocation of the Neutrality Act by the President. This for two reasons: first, because it is the law of the land; second, because it is the desirable policy to follow in all war situations. With the first of these positions, I agree, but I have serious difficulty with the second. In view of your emphasis for the past twenty years on the importance of the use of experimental intelligence in the social realm, how do you justify this neutrality legislation? It asks us to define our action before we have examined the situation with which we have to deal. It asks us to hold inflexibly to a rule of action regardless of what the consequences are which flow from that action. Does your support of this plan of blind adherence to a predetermined rule mean that you have abandoned the principle of experimental intelligence in the international realm?

3. You also state that one of the virtues of the Neutrality Act is "that many of its provisions were made mandatory, without regard to the effect on any particular belligerent." Does The New Republic imply by this that so far as national policies are concerned we have no interest in discriminating between the aggressor and the victim nation? This gets rid of "moralistic" factors all right, but at a price many would not want to pay. In the domestic economic and social field you believe it is fundamentally important to distinguish between the exploiter and the exploited. Why does this distinction lose its relevance in the international field? May it not be that people schooled to ignore ethical factors in one area may become blunted to their significance in another?

4. During the past few months you have asserted repeatedly that there is no realistic middle term between a policy of strict isolation and neutrality, on the one hand, and a policy of recklessly plunging into a world war in which all liberal interests would be the loser, on the other. You have at times recognized that a policy of international intervention conceivably might be effectual and not lead to war, but its chance of success has seemed so slight that you have urged isolation as the only defensible policy for our nation. At the same time, during the past year you have been very critical of Britain's failure to take a clear, strong stand on the Spanish situation. By what process do you reconcile these conflicting conceptions? For example, on the Far Eastern situation you comment in the October 20 issue as follows:

> The inescapable lesson from all this is—when a nation is bent upon military aggression, there is no way to stop her save ability and readiness to defeat her by force of arms. There is a slight chance of preserving peace by "concerted action of peace-loving nations" if these nations can surely enforce their will and are known by the trouble-makers to be willing to do so. Otherwise all the talk of collective security is dangerous nonsense. Unless we are prepared to fight Japan, Italy and Germany before things get any worse and are willing convincingly to say so, we had much better adopt a firm policy of abstention in the first place.

In the November 17 issue you refer to Britain and Spain in this manner:

> The more they [the Fascist powers] create the impression that destiny is on their side, or that they are more resolute and more clever than their opponents, the more open support they may expect, even within the nations that now are lined up against them. It is one of the mysteries of diplomacy why a game that is so obvious should be allowed to go on for so long. The answer may be that Great Britain has a divided heart as well as a divided mind. She will, of course, eventually, and if worst comes to worst, come to the aid of France. But in the meantime she is encouraging her potential enemies to hope that she will surrender with-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out a struggle, and she is enlarging their power to challenge her. A firm stand in Spain at the beginning would have saved infinite trouble.

Why one logic for Britain in Spain, and another for us in the Far East? Will the editors please explain why "a firm stand" by the powers which met at Brussels would not have even greater possibilities for good? It is no answer to tell us that American opinion would not support such a firm stand. To the limit of its influence The New Republic has sought to create an extreme isolationist American mentality.

5. Finally, what is the program which The New Republic would have us adopt in the international field? Undoubtedly to get rid of war we must eliminate the conditions that breed war. To be sure, to socialize our domestic economy is fundamental in this connection. But that is a large task which will take time if it is to be accomplished by peaceful means. In the meantime, the world situation grows more unstable and menacing. Unless some direct approach is made to the world problem, it is entirely possible that some sudden development in the foreign scene may sweep us into the world conflict which The New Republic rightly fears. Can we safely continue to concentrate exclusively on the domestic task when the international situation is so precarious? Should Japan triumph in the Far East, the reactionary and war forces within our nation will be in much stronger position. In other words, there are risks in the policy of isolation and inaction as well as in a program of international intervention. What, then, is the full program of your journal?

JOHN L. CHILDS.

Teachers' College, New York City.

[1. The statements mean just what they say, and constitute a warning against entanglement on the plea that we have a substantial economic or military interest to defend. Just how would Japan's conquest of China threaten our "security" or "internationl position"? These are the kind of undefined abstractions that cloud issues. Mr. Childs hates to see China conquered by Japan, and so do we, but it is a far cry from that to saying there is a sufficient national interest to fight for.

2. The Neutrality Act is in itself an attempt to apply experimental intelligence—it makes use of the lessons we should learn from the last war. One of these lessons is that if, *after a war starts,* we decree measures that injure one belligerent more than another, we can be accused of unneutrality. But if the measures are adopted before a specific war breaks out, and are made mandatory, no belligerent has a right to such a complaint. Another is that when a war breaks out, all the agencies of profit-seeking war trade and all the incidents connected with war trade, conspire to keep us from remaining at peace, but if we prevent these interests and incidents from arising, by legislation adopted in advance, we have a better chance of keeping out. Experimental intelligence does not forbid preplanning against emergencies.

3. The question is not whether we should disapprove of aggressors, but what we can and should do about our disapproval.

4. What escapes Professor Childs in the editorial position of The New Republic, and what will reconcile the statements that seem to him conflicting, is our judgment that unless we and the other democracies will take *effective* action in support of threats against aggression, and are known to be ready to take such action, the threats do not do any good and the United States had better not try to strike ineffectual and unrealistic moral attitudes about international affairs. Britain (and the United States) could have taken a firm stand in Spain in support of the Loyalist government without much danger of war. They cannot do so in the case of China.

5. We do not believe a world war can be prevented by threats, unless the threats are of a kind which would drag us in, if the prevention is unsuccessful. If such a war cannot be prevented by other means, therefore, we think the attention of the United States should be concentrated on staying out. This is not a program of inaction, but one of vigorous and difficult action. We do not believe in isolation as a peacetime policy, but we do believe in isolation from a virulent contagion, the outbreak of which we cannot prevent.—THE EDITORS.]

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Eastman as Oracle

SIR: It is amusing good news that the Stalinist axe has fallen upon you at last. Your editorial of December 8 in which you naïvely imagine that "The New Masses is hurt" by your article, "Japan's 'Divine Mission,'" does you credit. It shows that you have been equally naïve in taking the Machiavellian tricks of the Stalinists at their face value when others were the victims.

Let me inform you, as one who has been a favored victim of these tricks for fourteen years, that your article on Japan had nothing to do with the causes of the attack. The editors of The New Masses are not in the least deluded, as you truly say that no intelligent reader could be, about the meaning of Mr. Price's article, or the satire in its title. Nor is it pertinent for you to ask them to "cool down." They are coolly and very deliberately misrepresenting the meaning of your title in order, as far as their influence extends, to destroy your prestige as a progressive paper, and kill your circulation. They are doing this as the result of a Party decision obedient to a policy laid down by the Führer in Moscow. (*Vozhd* is the Russian word.) And they are doing it because in your issue of November 24 you gave space to Bertram D. Wolfe's opinion that Trotsky "could not have done the things charged against him" in the Moscow trials.

You had up to that point in all essentials lent your columns to the manipulation of public opinion in America by the Moscow Leader. Your missteps, that is, were only the minor ones useful in keeping up the important understanding that, while supporting the Stalinist line, you were not a Stalinist organ. But this is too much. This puts you explicitly on the side of enlightenment as against manipulation. This brings your head under the axe.

I predict that from now on your disillusionment with the All-Russian and International Hoax of Stalin's communism will be comparatively swift. You can hardly fail to reflect that, whereas this unscrupulous blow fell only upon your reputation in a group of gullible readers, and you were able to answer it, had you been in Russia it would have been read by the entire nation, and no answer, even delivered orally and behind the curtains of your own domicile, would have been possible to you. You would in fact have been in jail. Moreover, the blow at your reputation would have been a preliminary formality. You would have been brought to trial as a pro-Japanese "spy, saboteur and wrecker." Does not the title of your article, "Japan's 'Divine Mission,'" prove that you are one? Can you honestly make any answer—especially with nobody listening to you? And you would have been shot in the cellar of the Lubianka prison and carried out with the garbage. If, however, you happened to be the type of a person who can be morally broken by a psychological, physical or chemical third degree, *without plainly showing in your features what you have been*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through, you would have appeared in a public a few hours before your death, and to the astonishnment of your readers and the whole world convincingly have declared that the title "Japan's 'Divine Mission'" was not satirical, that the quotation marks around "Divine Mission" were put in to mislead the GPU, and that besides publishing that article you had wrecked 5,000 railroads and blown up fourteen sugar factories in the cause of Japanese imperialism.

That is what would have happened to you in Russia. And that also is what would happen here, if the editors of The New Masses and the local *Vozhdi*—who, you may be sure, have orders for this change of "party line"—possessed political as well as journalistic power.

Once more I congratulate you, and hope for your complete recovery and speedy return to the labor of human enlightenment on all fronts.

Croton, N. Y. MAX EASTMAN.

[With trepidation we await the fulfilment of Max Eastman's prophecy that we are marked victims of the GPU. In the meantime we want to assure him that we know more about the Communists than he thinks we do—perhaps even more than he himself does. For a long time we suffered under Communist attacks, which of course were as unfair and deliberately misrepresentative as Mr. Eastman well knows opposition always is. But when the Communists came over to our previously held position that there should be a united front of leftward and progressive forces in the United States, for immediate gains, the building of a labor movement and resistance to fascist tendencies and war, we naturally welcomed their conversion as strongly as we had formerly criticized them for what seemed to us their mistakes and disruptive tactics. This, in the eyes of those who attach no importance to anything in the world except the warfare between the adherents of Stalin and Trotsky, was labeled "Stalinism." Now we suppose any disagreement with the Communists will cause us to be called "Trotskyites." We are certain that the breach in the present instance was occasioned, however, not by a passage in any review about Trotsky, but by the obvious fact that we differ from the Communists in preferring abstention from war to "collective security." We shall continue as always in our own native way, neither Stalinist nor Trotskyist, saying what we believe, reporting what we can be sure of when it is important, welcoming agreement and countering disagreement whatever the source.—THE EDITORS.]

Public Opinion and The Eagle Strike

SIR: If you are a student of mass psychology I hope you have been taking due note of the current laboratory experiment in the handling of "public opinion" by our powerful and free press.

There is, of course, public opinion and "public opinon," and the two are easily confused. Thus there has been a strike of 250 newspaper people under the Newspaper Guild against the reactionary publisher of The Brooklyn Eagle. Three months of it put the publisher in desperate straits, what with advertising dropping out like flies. So-called secondary picketing of advertisers, by which their customers were informed they would be patronizing a scab publication, helped.

Suddenly, in the news columns and on the editorial pages, secondary picketing became a vital and world-shaking issue. A scandal, if you please, of such major proportions that one afternoon newspaper carried five editorial denunciations in a week. "Liberal" and frankly reactionary papers played the same tune. Public opinion, they said, was aroused and "inflamed" against the awful practice. Actually, the only public expression on the subject was a trade-union mass meeting AGAINST picketing restrictions.

After repeated shoutings of "public opinion," the newspapers, which have a special dollars-and-cents interest in beating this strike, have probably convinced themselves that public opinion is actually disturbed by the picketing of a few of Publisher Goodfellow's advertisers (there are only a few left).

If, now, they can convince the police and the courts that that's how public opinion has swung, the trick is done.

I. KAUFMAN, Chairman,
Brooklyn, N. Y. Eagle Strike Committee.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

A reader points out a slip made by T. R. B. in Washington Notes for December 1 when he said "There are many corporations—the great American Telephone and Telegraph Company, to cite a shining example—that have consistently distributed the full amount of their earnings for many years past." It would have been more accurate to say that there are many corporations which distribute so large a part of their earnings each year that they would not be affected by an undistributed-surplus tax. Of these, the A. T. and T. would certainly be one. . . . John B. Andrews of New York City calls attention to an article appearing in The American Labor Legislation Review for December about the silicosis compensation law in New York, showing how the amendment of 1936 has destroyed the original intent of the act to a large degree.

Henry Levy of Philadelphia describes the private boycott of Japanese goods in the United States and urges determined participation in it by readers of The New Republic. . . . Robert Allen Patterson of New York City takes the side of Tony Sender and Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld in the debate about whether Dr. Rudolf Kircher, as a Nazi apologist, ought to have been allowed to speak before the Foreign Policy Association. Mr. Sender and Dr. Rosenfeld, in a letter in the December 1 issue, said they thought he should not. In an editorial foonote in the same issue the editors said they thought he should. Mr. Patterson thinks he should not on the grounds that "you must learn to be intolerant of those who would make the world intolerable."

Albert Cherney of Chicago expresses his disapproval of The New Republic's policy toward the Sino-Japanese war. . . . Dr. Frank Thomas Woodbury of the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City, appeals for funds to replace the ambulances and medical supplies destroyed in the recent bombing by Rebel planes of the evacuation hospitals in Tarancon, a loss estimated at $15,000. . . . Vito Marcantonio, president of the International Labor Defense, writes from its headquarters at 80 East Eleventh Street, New York City, to appeal for contributions for the Christmas drive for labor's prisoners and their families. The quota they are trying to fill (which must last through the entire year) is $25,000.

Dr. Co Tui writes of the formation of the American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, of which he is chairman. The Bureau is composed of American and Chinese physicians in this country and it is engaged in raising funds to buy medical supplies that are urgently needed. Checks should be made payable to Mr. C. H. Wang and sent to him at the Bureau, 40 East Thirty-fourth Street, New York City.

What's on the Air?

Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, Mrs. Walter Seymour, Mrs. Eugene Meyer and Kathleen Norris speak on the topic, "Will the American Home Survive?" Thursday, December 16, 4:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Herbert Hoover speaks on "Economic Security and the Individual," Thursday, December 16, 10 P.M., CBS.

H. G. Wells speaks in one of the series of international broadcasts from London, "As I See It," Tuesday, December 21, 4:20 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Dr. Alfred E. Cohn of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research discusses "Heart Disease as a Public Health Problem," Wednesday, December 22, 3:45 P.M., CBS.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include a presentation of "Mr. Justice," a dramatization of the life of Oliver Wendell Holmes, directed by Irving Reis and presented by the "Columbia Workshop," Thursday, December 16, 10:30 P.M., CBS; the Metropolitan Opera broadcast of Wagner's "Die Walkure" with Kirsten Flagstad and Lauritz Melchior; two broadcasts by the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, the first a Young People's Concert, Saturday, December 18, 11 A.M., and the second the regular Sunday afternoon concert, December 19, 3 P.M., both over the Columbia Broadcasting System; and Hepzibah and Yehudi Menuhin, with an orchestra and chorus directed by Eugene Ormandy, Sunday, December 19, 9 P.M., CBS.

All times given are Eastern Standard Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Fiction for the Millions

The Flivver King, by Upton Sinclair. Detroit: The United Automobile Workers of America; Pasadena: Upton Sinclair. 25 cents.

THIS BRIEF biography of Henry Ford, bound in green paper covers and selling for a quarter, is part of an edition of 200,000 distributed by the United Auto Workers. Since it appears at a moment when the union's struggle with the Ford Motor Company is approaching a climax, it is of interest apart from its value as a concise, readable biography—it suggests what unions can do in the way of making good, relevant writing available for their members, and it also suggests subjects for other books that could be of general interest and yet have practical value in union organizing campaigns. A careful study of Weir and the history of National Steel, of Grace and the history of Bethlehem, written, like Upton Sinclair's biography of Ford, without rhetoric, with careful appraisals of the personalities involved, and brought out by the SWOC (or a factual account of the merchant marine, prepared by the NMU), could do more to win public opinion than any number of appeals based on the abstract right to organize.

As a rule, workers know very little about the histories of the companies they work for, or the personalities of the men who dominate them, but they are usually interested in finding out, and a series of books modeled on "The Flivver King" could be a contribution to working-class literature as well as a social survey of importance. There is another point. It is impossible to imagine the Ford Motor Company—or for that matter any corporation of consequence—distributing to its employees writing as balanced and intelligent as this. You cannot conceive of Ford—or any ghost of his—preparing a history of the Auto Workers, or a biography of Homer Martin or John Lewis, that would be written with as much human feeling for the subject, with as much generosity, or from a point of view that placed the men in historical perspective.

Henry Ford is an almost perfect subject for Sinclair. The quixotic, visionary streak in Ford makes him a congenial figure, since Sinclair's own quixotic adventures have been on no mean scale—Sinclair is probably the only writer in the country who could write with unforced sympathy about the Peace Ship. In the same way Sinclair can take those beliefs of Ford—his adherence to New Thought, for example—which would alienate most contemporary writers so completely that only satire would satisfy them. Apparently Sinclair has known Ford, and was present when King Gillette, another baffled capitalist reformer, tried to interest Ford in his idea for a people's corporation that would run the business of the country in the public interest. This meeting of minds Sinclair compares with the click of two ivory billiard balls.

The billionaire who emerges from "The Flivver King" is a human being, cranky, limited, powerful, narrow, bewildered and even pathetic, but the frightful social cost of his obtuseness is made clear; the danger in his combination of great power and narrowness of vision is plainly revealed; and even the pathos of Ford's life is seen as an experience of far coarser texture than the tragedy of one of his impoverished employees. He is presented like the hero of a Horatio Alger story who made good on a scale Alger never dreamed of (some of the writing also calls Alger to mind): an ambitious, skillful mechanic in his early life; a democrat, a reformer, an enemy of war and Wall Street in his first success; at last a Jew-baiter, an arch-reactionary, piddling around with his antiques, his square dances and his old-time fiddlers, haunted by the fear of kidnapers, while his thugs take care of the men trying to organize his workers.

But with all this "The Flivver King" reads like the scenario of a major work. Ford's rise is compared with the decline of one of his old employees, a neighbor in his early days, and it is the son of this ruined loyal worker who becomes a union organizer and is beaten up for being one. The last scene in the book is like a rough sketch for a masterpiece: Ford, serious and smiling, marching through the stiff prances of a square dance, balancing his partner, tripping forward and back and sashaying out, while in the darkness after a meeting the organizer and his wife are pulled out of their car and left unconscious in the road. Effective as it is, the climax reveals the biggest weakness of "The Flivver King." It lacks, like so much of Sinclair's work, a sense of complexity; the forces in conflict are so plainly identified that the ambiguities which normally arrest our decisions are lacking.

When you think of the book in relation to Ford's individual career it seems complete and rounded. But when you think of it in relation to the tremendous drama of Detroit—the Auto Workers rising in the greatest drive in trade-union history, the tragic factional fights in its leadership, the national issues at stake in its current battle with Ford—when you think of the book in relation to this mass of conflicting problems, matters of strategy, of policy, of savage personal rivalries, you see that it does not throw light where illumination is urgently needed. We know that union men are beaten up and that millionaires habitually drift into strange pastimes, usually less innocent than square dancing; and although it cannot be pointed out too often, we also need to know more: the subtler influences that paralyze organizations of workers from within; the sources of the conflicts that enfeeble them or prevent them from realizing their aims.

ROBERT CANTWELL.

In Praise of Prairie

The elm tree is our highest mountain peak;
A five-foot drop a valley, so to speak.

A man's head is an eminence upon
A field of barley spread beneath the sun.

Horizons have no strangeness to the eye.
Our feet are sometimes level with the sky

When we are walking on a treeless plain,
With ankles bruised from stubble of the grain.

The fields stretch out in long, unbroken rows.
We walk aware of what is far and close.

Here distance is familiar as a friend.
The feud we kept with space comes to an end.

THEODORE ROETHKE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soldiers and Society

A History of Militarism: Romance and Reality of a Profession, by Alfred Vagts. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 510 pages. $4.75.

MAN IS the animal who makes ends of his means and enslaves himself to his own machines. Servants are honored until they make themselves masters. The chosen few who serve, whether they be a ruling class or merely an aristocracy of skill, strive always to maximize the satisfactions of their high position. They seek to identify themselves with the whole community and to subordinate everything and everybody to the enhancement of their own prestige.

Of no group of professional specialists has this been more true in modern times than military and naval officers. Entrusted by governments with the technical and administrative tasks of national defense (or national aggression), the career men of the armed services have usually sought to increase the scope and cost of their work—not because enlarged national objectives have necessarily required more abundant instrumentalities of coercion for their attainment, but because larger armies and navies have invariably afforded more positions of rank, more opportunities for advancement, more income and glory for the men-at-arms. Soldiers serving civilians have, whenever possible, taken control of policy out of the hands of civilians and shaped it to serve themselves.

The many ramifications and implications of this relationship are explored in Alfred Vagts's fascinating volume. His thesis is built upon the distinction between the "military way" and the "militaristic way." The former involves the most efficient and economical use of resources to achieve objectives fixed by non-military authorities. The latter involves efforts by military leaders to butter their own bread by fastening themselves, parasitically, upon the whole of society. "Rejecting the scientific character of the military way, militarism displays the qualities of caste and cult, authority and belief." Militarists are moved not by service to government or country, but by romance, tradition, egotism and greed. For conscripts and taxpayers the result is stupidity, waste and horror.

This thesis is not new. It is the *Leitmotif* of Lloyd George's war memoirs and of many other civilian commentaries upon professional soldiers. What is new and immensely valuable in Dr. Vagts's volume is a painstaking and critical compilation of historical data bearing upon the many aspects of the problem. The book is studded with quotations, citations and pungent cartoons and photographs. Its defects are few. The crowding of all footnotes into the last twenty pages is inconvenient. The absence of a separate bibliography is deplorable. The lack of an index is unforgivable. But the author has used all the perspectives and insights of *Kulturgeschichte* in gathering and digesting a huge mass of evidence and in distilling out of it, in smooth prose, a large number of suggestive interpretations and conclusions. Military theory and philosophy, strategic plans, army organization, arms races, new weapons, war propaganda, war potentials—all are here surveyed with rich erudition and discriminating judgment. Dr. Vagts is among those German scholars in exile for whom America must give thanks to Hitler.

The narrative, which is brilliantly analytical rather than merely chronological, follows the major epochs in the development of modern militarism: from feudal knights and early mercenaries to small, professional standing armies; from small armies to mass forces raised by conscription; from conscript armies to contemporary totalitarianism and the "Society-in-Arms, regimented down to the very infants, fused with consciousness of some supra-national 'race,' 'soil' or 'history,' economically and mentally mobilized, forever standing in readiness for the 'total war.'" Dr. Vagts devotes half his pages to the past quarter of a century. In fascism the militarists' dream is at last fully realized: society exists solely for the state; the state exists solely for preparing war. Means have become ends. The part has swallowed the whole. And therewith come again days of ancient evil.

While little is lacking in this record, one might wish for more detailed treatment of the correlation between militarism and the changing relations of social classes. The analysis might have been sharpened by reflection upon the theme of Silas B. McKinley's "Democracy and Military Power": that social and political democracy waxes when massed infantry is the decisive tool of war and wanes when victory goes to the select few equipped with weapons beyond the reach of the common man. There is also need for further inquiry into another question: the degree to which, and the conditions under which, insecure ruling classes protect themselves from popular unrest by fostering militarism. Elites in the vigor of youth and élites in the agonies of death both tend to seek security in militarism. The practitioners of violence are apotheosized at the dawn and dusk of cultures. Fascist militarism is obviously a phenomenon of social decay. When decay is unchecked it spreads. As it spreads in the years to come, there will be increasing demands and increasing opportunities for study of the problems with which Dr. Vagts deals. For it is true of societies, as of individuals, that those who are sick have often no other pleasure than the contemplation of their own diseases. This is particularly the case when the diseases are incurable.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN.

Pioneers of Medicine

Doctors on Horseback: Pioneers of American Medicine, by James Thomas Flexner. New York: The Viking Press. 384 pages, illustrated. $2.75.

THERE were other pioneers of American medicine beside those chosen by Mr. Flexner. Certainly in any such hall of fame Nathan Smith deserves a niche of his own. But the selections are colorful and striking, and they include unhappy John Morgan, founder of the first American medical school and first Surgeon in Chief to Washington's army; Benjamin Rush, who "while sedulously employed in scuffling up his little hillock of fame" had time to sign the Declaration of Independence (there were five physician signers), be a wordy *politico* and let a lot of blood; Ephraim McDowell, who had the courage to open the peritoneum and performed the first recorded ovariotomy; Daniel Drake, the stormy "leader in the second conquest of the West," and William Beaumont, the romantic Connecticut boy who became the foremost American physiologist. Beaumont alone of all the group made a memorable contribution to medical science; his stature grows with the years.

Although this book is a collection of biographies, the author has, by skillfully integrating the lives of John Morgan and Benjamin Rush and including much of the career of William Shippen, been successful in producing a medical history of Philadelphia when that city was the unchallenged medical capital of the continent. Again, by combining

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the studies of Crawford Long and W. T. G. Morton in the "Death of Pain," Mr. Flexner has written more than biography. This part of the book deals with the discovery of the use of ether as an anesthetic and the bitter controversy that arose as to which of the claimants was entitled to priority—even the Congress of the United States could not decide it; it was the "Ether War." The author with nice diplomacy suggests that the battle be called a draw, naming both contestants victors. In effect that is what has been done. Both monuments have been erected.

The record of William Beaumont's years of patient and trying study of the wounded St. Martin will always stand as the great epic of American medicine. It is told here with fine detail and clarity. Indeed it appears that the author is impressed with the high import of his subject and abandons his somewhat dramatic style to produce an excellent historical document. There should be, however, no criticism of the writers' style—there was drama in the lives of these men and with keen sense Mr. Flexner has found it out and set it down. Of the many versions of the McDowell episode none brings out the stark reality of that Christmas morning in Danville like this one. It was fine theatre and Mr. Flexner knows it.

Most of the recognized sources seem to have been explored and the author has been successful in remaining neutral in the many controversies and feuds that presented themselves, except when he quite clearly puts Rush in the Conway cabal. Although this reviewer agrees with him, he may find himself on the defensive. The many portraits add to the volume and there is an interesting bibliography and a carefully prepared index.

CREIGHTON BARKER, M.D.

A Trail Trails Off

From These Roots: The Ideas That Have Made Modern Literature, by Mary M. Colum. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 394 pages. $2.50.

AFTER the first few pages of "From These Roots," I wrote down tentatively, for the title of my review: "A Nice Pale Book." A few pages further, and I had become ashamed of myself. I decided that I had wronged both author and reviewer atrociously, in even thinking of such a title tentatively as the organizing basis of my review. So I wrote down a possible title having totally different leads: "Information About Critics, Gracefully."

The radical change was a wise one. In her characterizations of the pivotal literary critics in Western history, from the time of Lessing until the recent past, Mrs. Colum has done a remarkably discerning piece of work. Her task was to bring out the salient traits of each such writer, to give the summarizations and apt citations that name the writer's number. Such naming must satisfy at least three major tests: (1) It must locate the man in the general continuity of Western thought; (2) it must give the essence of the man, as a total personality, regardless of his indebtedness to others; (3) it must give the essence of his special contribution or emphasis, his addition as innovator.

On the first point Mrs. Colum is weakest, as treatment of the general philosophic trend that lies behind literary critics is skimped. It is also this skimping, perhaps, that accounts for her superficial treatment of the relation between the esthetic and the practical, and her blunt analysis of moral rhetoric. But I believe that she will repeatedly delight her readers by her taste and discernment in the featuring of the salient, as per points two and three. She is not an impressionistic critic; yet her characterizations are highly evocative. By a deft mixture of conceptual formulas and revealing metaphors (usually selected from the authors themselves) she "places" her subjects with a minimum of detail. A mode of presentation that she admires in modern poetry, she has herself effectively employed in its critical counterparts.

As the book proceeds, a subtle change of emphasis takes place. While still looking for key formulas and crucial metaphors, Mrs. Colum becomes increasingly concerned with the specific works of art that embody critical theories, rather than with the theories themselves. As I noted this gradual change from a book *about* literary criticism to a book *of* literary criticism, I wanted to revise my title once more, seeking this time something that would "sloganize" a change of emphasis perhaps unintentionally made by the writer in the course of following out her program.

The shift is responsible for some of the best pages in the book. Her discussion of Flaubert and Baudelaire, and of subsequent offshoots from their writings, ranks high in the field of appreciation. But this gradual shift from critics to poets also has an unfortunate consequence, as we note drastically when we arrive at her concluding chapter, "Where We Are." We are presumably nowhere—so the author ends on a devout and exalted prayer, calling in vatic terms for someone to come and redeem us. And as parting recipe for solace, we are told that "the despair of modern philosophies would be intolerable if one did not know with Proust that Time touches everything, that Time changes everything, that spring succeeds winter . . ." etc. The chapter also says some cutting things about "trade-writing," a category that includes not only the output of the commercialists, but also the output of those who would imaginatively exhort against commercialism. Thus does Mrs. Colum get us coming and going, with no specific solution, but only a blanket solution, "Time." At this point, I hope, the reader will become quite irreverent. I do plead with him to interject: "To hell with 'Time'—what about 'the times'?"

It would seem that Mrs. Colum, in her gradual change of stress, narrowed down her interests from *criticism in general* to *one specific poetic movement embodying past criticism* (the movement that culminates in such writers as Valéry). The result is that she doesn't even consider recent innovations in critical technique. She has trailed down a trail to the point where it trailed off. Hence, without so much as mentioning recent trends in literary analysis, she makes her moving appeal to a kind of seasonality that would operate without men and measures.

Mrs. Colum frequently pays tribute to innovators. Even too much tribute, I should think, since innovation *per se* has no value. The important test is: *innovation for what?* But present changes in our social situation require corresponding changes in the technique of analysis; we are getting this change in technique; and ironically, Mrs. Colum, who has praised many dead innovators, does not so much as refer glancingly to the new trends. Even so well known a work as I. A. Richards' "Principles of Literary Criticism" is totally neglected. Similarly with Empson and Spurgeon, or with Wilson's "Axel's Castle" and Blackmur's "Double Agent" in America. There is no consideration of the part that has been and can be played by Gestalt psychology, studies in the development of meaning by investigators like Piaget, or the many sociological speculations stemming largely from Bentham's analysis of language. There are under development new instruments for the description of poetic organization, of linguistic action, of appeals and commands to audience and self. Maybe it will come to nothing—but the thought of this rich field, with its fertile

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leads already scattered through a hundred or so intelligent books, is enough to make one ask himself whether Mrs. Colum, for all her appreciation of past glories, isn't even something of a vandal when she trails off into a prayer, precisely at a time when such fresh critical departures are gaining vigor and clarity of formulation. Presumably she had invested so strongly in a movement of the recent past that she could not see values in anything else. Such absorption is to her credit as an individual. But however much respect we pay it as a moral attribute, we must recognize the limitations it places upon her perceptions as a critic.

KENNETH BURKE.

The Spirit of Science

Madame Curie, by Eve Curie. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 404 pages. $3.50.

IN WRITING her mother's biography, Eve Curie had the advantage of dealing with one of the most genuinely noble characters ever combined with scientific genius. One gets the impression that this was a congenial task for the author, who occasionally gets bogged down in her own superlatives. But if her treatment is not so dispassionate as one might wish, it is surely as honest and as comprehensive. Through the film of adoration Marie Curie's life shines out clearly, from the spirited Polish girl rebelling against the humiliations of a Tsarist regime to the eminent scientist remaining, as her daughter remarks, very nearly unaware of her astonishing destiny.

The first part of the book, dealing with those dark, struggling years which Marie herself loved best, makes the most interesting reading. When Marie came to Paris after a stifling interlude as governess, she was too enchanted by the "poetry of science" to notice the absence of light and heat in her garret, the menace to health in hasty nibblings at radishes and cherries, or the loneliness of life on three francs a day. Too preoccupied, almost, to notice Pierre Curie, until his gentle insistence brought her around to the beginning of a rare love and an even rarer collaboration. When they married, their flat was equipped with just two chairs, deliberately uncomfortable to discourage relaxation or visitors. Their laboratory was a shed long since abandoned by the School of Physics as not good enough for cadavers, but the best a wealthy Paris could spare for her two leading physicists. Their life was compounded of poverty and disappointments and a hope which their colleagues regarded with skeptical indulgence. And after four years of steaming cauldrons and massive filters, of ovens and reaction vats, the Curies released radium from a mass over ten million times its size.

Fame had just begun to trickle in when Pierre was killed in a street accident. The author at this point is wise enough to quote from Marie's diary—excerpts which lift what might have been bitter-sweet sentimentality to the level of unrelenting tragedy. Finally there is the woman solitary in the midst of renown, bitter at the lack of understanding in a public whose recognition came too late to give Pierre a laboratory.

Because Eve Curie's scientific training goes little deeper than a nostalgic memory of childhood meals devoted to technical dialogues, the emphasis in this book is placed not so much on the mechanics and chemical implications of the process that her parents evolved as on the fervent, almost ruthless devotion that made this process possible. What you remember is their instinctive shrinking from praise, their ineptitude for swagger, their view of honors not only as superfluous but as a travesty on their aims and a constriction of their work. When, in 1902, they gave up a future of fabulous wealth by refusing to patent their discoveries, the thought that sacrifice was involved never occurred to them: they were simply following the line of the "scientific spirit."

With this disinterested attitude one contrasts the Belgian mining syndicate which held a practical monopoly for more than a decade through ownership of deposits in the Congo, shrouded its operations in secrecy, and sold radium at some $70,000 a gram when a price less than half as large would still have afforded a handsome profit. Or the patent-medicine quacks who saw in radium a boon to the sale of "rejuvenating," "radioactive" and, incidentally, often fatal cure-alls. Or even the manufacturers who pounced on it for luminous dials and timepieces at a time when cancer treatments were being held up for lack of the element. To such as these, whose dealings with radium have been colored only by callousness and greed, Marie Curie's life remains a tacit and indestructible rebuke.

MIRIAM BORGENICHT.

Wisdom of India

The Ten Principal Upanishads, put into English by Shree Purohit Swami and W. B. Yeats. New York: The Macmillan Company. 159 pages. $2.

SEVERAL years ago, in writing his preface to "The Holy Mountain," a record of prayer and pilgrimage by the Indian mystic Bhagwan Shri Hamsa, Yeats defined a contrast between the rival worlds of Balzac and the Brahmin priest: the one a world of personal identity and social purpose, aggressive in spirit and individualistic in its concepts; the other a realm in which the individual self is "possessed of such power and knowledge" that it becomes identified "with that Self without limitation or sorrow, containing and contained by all." In this polarity lies the spiritual dilemma of Western man, and it forms the axis upon which some of the most significant poetry of our time—"The Waste Land" notably—has turned. In his search for a myth or a faith with which to test the Western doctrine of action, the poet—who may be Eliot, Pound, Perse, A.E. or Yeats himself—has gone to the East for its concepts of prudence, quietism and renunciation, and where these have not been taken as invitations to escape or moral irresponsibility, they have invigorated the imagination of the European mind in one of its darkest moments of confusion and doubt.

It was for the purpose of recovering in English the essential humanity of the Vedantic scriptures that the present translation was undertaken. In its serene and noble clarity it discards the fustian of academic translation, "that polyglot, hyphenated, latinized, muddied muddle that froze belief"; and by freeing the Upanishads of scholarly accretions, it brings to light the qualities of sincerity, passion, humor, realism and ecstasy that compel belief in either ritual or poetry. Readers will go to it not only for the freshest rendering that has yet been given to the Indian rites and teachings, but for an important source of myth and symbolism in the poetry of our time. In the beautiful English that Yeats has added to his collaborator's rough version of the Sanscrit originals, students should have no difficulty in recognizing both an accent and an attitude that have played their part in his own verse and that of some of his most distinguished contemporaries.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

The Gardener Who Saw God, by Edward James. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

THE SETTING of this novel is a vast English estate which is made the center of a picture of decadence and the meeting place of a remarkable collection of personalities and issues. Here is some very able characterization: Sir Tatton Grantley, dead before the book begins but brilliantly brought to life as the Edwardian eccentric and savant; his son, lumpish, kind and utterly ignorant of the treasures he has inherited; the household of servants trained to the estate regime since childhood, and—the satirical side of the medal—the do-nothings who wander from Mayfair to the Riviera and back as regularly as the seasons change. Finally—and a perfectly drawn picture it is—the surrealist peer who has outraged the whole county by filling his ancestral lakes with marble poached eggs and the branches of his oaks with grand pianos. And through all this strange jumble, a mixed atmosphere of cynicism and mystic reflection, moves the gardener, the plain man with the simple heart who has been sadly overworked in England; an English Mr. Deeds who, when dizzy with music, sees God in the garden, points the collapse of the regime that employs him and demands in its place a truer comradeship from the reader.

This book can be recommended for the excellent handling of its very diverse types and incidents and for the ability with which the author succeeds in stringing them on a single thread without artifice. It belongs in that semi-mystical, semi-moralistic class of English novels that has grown so rapidly in recent years, but through its erudition and narrative qualities it stands head and shoulders above the bulk of its fellow visionaries.

RICHARD VAUGHAN.

The Tranquil Heart: Portrait of Giovanni Boccaccio, by Catherine Carswell. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 362 pages. $3.50.

GIOVANNI BOCCACCIO, the illegitimate son of a Florentine banker, lived in an era of mock saintliness and much corruption. But, in accepting the heritage of his generation, Boccaccio broke away from its hypocrisies. He was one of the world's great lovers—and no stickler for virtue. He possessed his "Fiammetta" (although she was a married woman), lost her to others and continued to love her. In rejecting man's "perjury against nature," Boccaccio lifted his century from under the heal of the Church. Poverty, he thought, was no excuse for greed and, unlike Petrarch, he condemned patronage where patronage was in disaccord with his political principles. He was religious, yet late in life he refused the papal secretaryship.

Boccaccio's life was a full one. He saw the Black Plague, lost his loved ones in it, and from it drew the framework for his "Decameron." He saw and cried out against the horror of internecine warfare which all but devastated Italy. As ambassador to the popes and Camerlingo of Florence, he participated in politics. And throughout his life he showed unparalleled initiative in his literary endeavors. He was the first to write a biography of Dante, the first to lecture in the vernacular on the "Divine Comedy," the first to write a semi-autobiographical and realistic novel, the first to translate Homer. Chided by Petrarch for writing in the Tuscan dialect, nevertheless he persevered, and set the style for future centuries of Italian prose. Although he laughed, and heartily, at many things, his was neither a frivolous

One of the Notable Books of 1937

SELECTED BY THE EDITORS OF "THE NATION"

FOUR WAYS OF PHILOSOPHY

By IRWIN EDMAN

Author of *The Mind of Paul, Richard Kane Looks at Life*, etc.

"IT GIVES the reader the pleasure not only of a clear, understandable, often charming, always radiantly intelligent, presentation of that way of taking human life which is naturally his, but the far more unusual joy of getting some notion of how it is possible for other people to take life quite differently.... A book to read all of, or part of, according to one's intellectual powers; but not to be missed by anyone of mature intelligence."—DOROTHY CANFIELD, *Book-of-the-Month Club News.*

"A gracefully written discussion, serious but not at all opaque to the layman, of a philosophy considered in its logical, socially critical, mystical, and naturalistic aspects."—*The New Yorker.*

$2.00 at all bookstores, or

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY

257 Fourth Avenue, New York

NEW MEXICO WRITERS

Edited by HANIEL LONG
Associate Editors:
Witter Bynner Erna Fergusson
Paul Horgan Frieda Lawrence

PUBLISHED WEEKLY—
in The NEW MEXICO SENTINEL

READ—
Poetry, Prose, Criticism, such as:
ESTHER ARTHUR on MABEL LUHAN
ARTHUR D. FICKE MARIE GARLAND
KNUD MERRILL on D. H. LAWRENCE
THOMAS WOOD STEVENS N. J. TOOMER
ALDOUS HUXLEY

HOLIDAY OFFER—
$1.00 per year to New Republic readers for subscription mailed before January 1st. (Regular price $1.50.)

SEND THIS EXCITING WEEKLY GIFT OF LITERATURE FOR CHRISTMAS

The NEW MEXICO SENTINEL
P. O. Box 1721
Santa Fe, New Mexico

I want to read New Mexico Writers and enclose $1.00 for one year's subscription, as per your holiday offer to New Republic readers.

Name .....

Address .....

City and State .....

Send check, money-order, stamps or currency.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nor a hardened personality. His life was tragic in many respects, and dramatic always.

Although the seeds of all this information are contained in Catherine Carswell's biography, she fails to make it a living work. Apparently afraid of romanticizing Boccaccio's life, she has given us a source book, all brain and no body; in which a sly wit and a sane viewpoint are all but submerged in a maze of historical allusions and detailed erudition.

FRANCES VALENSI.

Twenty Years a Labor Spy, by GT-99. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 309 pages. $2.50.

THIS MAY be, as is claimed, the true first-person story of a man who for twenty years was a labor spy. On the other hand, the apparent frankness and genuineness of this story may be the protective coloration for an attempt to neutralize the bad press given the labor-spy industry by the La Follette investigation. The nobility of the work done by GT-99 under the direction of the Chief with the wonderful smile is certainly, as Li'l Abner would say, pee-koolyar. Steel workers are saved from a phony union seeking only their initiation fees, a crooked business agent is replaced by an honest one, miners are prevented from setting fire to a tipple, a "nest of thieves" is cleaned out of an oil refinery, valuable economies are suggested to employers, "wild-cat organizers" are halted in their efforts to cause unrest. Contrary to any opinion that the La Follette investigation may have fostered, the labor spy in the main leaves behind him satisfied and delighted workers after rescuing them from the horrors of their own unjustified discontent and ingratitude, or from the racketeers and thugs that constitute unionism. The labor spy? Just a charm boy spreading sweetness and light.

SAMUEL YELLEN.

Contributors

JONATHAN MITCHELL, who is well known to readers of The New Republic for his articles on politics and current affairs, lives in Washington, D. C.

H. N. BRAILSFORD, London correspondent for The New Republic, is widely known as a writer on history, economics and international affairs.

MORRIS L. COOKE is a consulting engineer who, until his recent resignation from the Rural Electrification Administration, was vice-chairman of the National Power Policy Committee.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD, director of the Spanish Information Bureau in New York City, has just returned from a visit to Spain.

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER was brought up in Minneapolis, was graduated from Wellesley, did social work, worked with the Chicago Federation of Labor for five years and is at present engaged in raising four children.

JOHN L. CHILDS is an associate professor in the Philosophy of Education Department at Teachers' College, Columbia University.

ROBERT CANTWELL, author of "Laugh and Lie Down" and "The Land of Plenty," is completing a third novel. He is on the staff of Time.

THEODORE ROETHKE is a native of Saginaw, Michigan, and was educated at Harvard and Michigan universities. As a member of the English Department of Pennsylvania State College he gives a course in verse writing.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, professor of Political Science at Williams College, is the author of "International Politics" and "Germany Since 1918."

CREIGHTON BARKER is an assistant professor of Otolaryngology at the Yale School of Medicine and executive secretary of the Connecticute State Medical Society.

KENNETH BURKE is the author of several books, including "Permanence and Change" and "Attitudes Toward History," both published in The New Republic Dollar Series.

MIRIAM BORGENICHT is a recent graduate of Barnard College and is now free-lancing in New York City.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL is the editor of "Literary Opinion in America," a collection of modern criticism recently published by Harpers.

RICHARD VAUGHAN is a young Englishman who has written and translated for a living both at home and in this country, where he is now living.

FRANCES VALENSI has written articles and book reviews for various publications in America and Europe.

SAMUEL YELLEN, an instructor in English at Indiana University, is the author of "American Labor Struggles."

SOVIET PUBLICATIONS in ENGLISH

MOSCOW NEWS Illustrated Weekly. Describes the achievements of the USSR in industry, agriculture, art, technics, etc. Deals with the international situation.
1 year, $2 6 months, $1 single copy, 5c

SOVIETLAND Illustrated Monthly. Acquaints you with the socialist construction in the Land of the Soviets on the theatre, music, sports.
1 year, $2 6 months, $1 single copy, 25c

USSR in CONSTRUCTION Large size pictorial. Beautiful pictures give a panorama of socialist industry, agriculture, general culture and everyday life in the Soviet Union.
1 year, $4 6 months, $2 single copy, 35c

INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE Monthly. Devoted to the socialist culture in USSR, to Soviet literature and art.
1 yr., $2.50 6 mos., $1.25 single copy, 25c

ECONOMIC SURVEY Monthly Magazine.
1 year, $2 6 months, $1 single copy, 20c

Subscription accepted by:

MEZHDUNARODNAJA KNIGA,
Kuznetski most, 18, MOSCOW, USSR.

BOOKNIGA CORPORATION
255 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Catalogues, Prospectuses and Sample Copies sent on request.

The Classified rate of The New Republic is $4 an inch for one insertion, $3.50 an inch for three insertions, $3.00 an inch for six insertions. Advertising Department, 40 East 49th St., N. Y. C.

LECTURES

THE GROUP
meet at Hotel Peter Stuyvesant, 9 West 86th St. Tuesday Evening, December 21 at 8:30 P.M.
Captain LUDWIG RENN
(Chief of Staff of International Brigade fighting with the Loyalists in Spain) will speak on
"WHO WILL WIN THE WAR IN SPAIN?"
CORLISS LAMONT, Guest Chairman
Social Hour — Refreshments — Subscription 50c
You can attend 80 evenings for $5.00 by subscribing

VITO MARCANTONIO speaks on "WHAT CONGRESS MUST DO." Sat. aft., Dec. 18, 2:30 P.M., 2nd floor, 35 E. 12 St., Workers School Lecture Series Adm. 25c.

SCOTT NEARING on "THE FIGHT FOR WORLD PEACE." Tues. eve., Dec. 21. Manhattan Opera House, 34th St. & 8th Ave., 8:30 P. M. Adm.: 50c.

LANGUAGES

SPANISH, FRENCH, RUSSIAN, ITALIAN, etc. Rapid-coverage Courses. Private Group, Phone Sets. Booklet R on request. LANGUAGE SERVICE, Lewis Bertrand, Director. 507 5th Avenue (42nd Street.) MUrray Hill 2-4221.

TREE-RIPENED INDIAN RIVER
Oranges and Grapefruit
Direct from our grove to you
55 lb. Basket—$3.25
We pay express east of Mississippi
Satisfaction and safe arrival guaranteed
Write for price list and folder
T. R. INDIAN RIVER ORANGE CO.
Cocoa, Florida
Our 11th Year — Serving 9,000 Customers

BOOKS

LIFE INSURANCE FOR THE CONSUMER. Where life insurance premiums go. The best policy—what it is, and what it could be. The best companies. Mimeographed. $1.50. Porter-Mason Service. Box 2561. Youngstown, O.

PAPISSA JOANNA: Translated from the Greek. A Book for the Discriminating Few. Satire and True Story on the Woman Pope. Unexpurgated, first time in English. Sent on receipt of remittance or C. O. D. $1.50 per copy. T. D. Kriton, 1427 Steiner Street San Francisco, Calif.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

DEAR SANTA CLAUS! please send me a subscription to CONTACTS this Christmas, for I want new friends and stimulating correspondents. Details, 3c stamp. Box 91 Station D, New York City.

HAPPINESS CIRCLE, the best anodyne for the lack of camaraderies. Enclose stamped envelope for details. Dept. W, Box 107, Grand Central Annex, New York.

CARE OF HOME

SECRETARY-HOUSEKEEPER; experienced responsible woman, with baby daughter, wishes care of motherless home. New York City or vicinity. References. Address: Box No. 46, The New Republic.

PRISONERS' CHRISTMAS

NEW or good used clothes for the wives and children of Labor's prisoners are urgently needed for their Christmas. Please send donations of clothes or money to: Rose Baron, International Labor Defense, 80 East 11th Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED